A Study of Hsin ch'ing-nien (New Youth) Magazine, 1915-1926

Ph.D. thesis submitted to

the University of London

by

King-Cheuk Ma

May 1974

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Abstract.

The intention in this thesis is to look at the changing political beliefs of China's radical intellectuals in the May Fourth Movement through an examination of the history of the Hsin ch'ing-nien (New Youth) magazine, published from 1915 to 1926 and recognised then and now as the most influential periodical of the movement.

Attention is first given to the pre-1919 stage of the May Fourth Movement, generally known as the New Culture Movement, in which the Hsin ch'ing-nien intellectuals were in the forefront of a cultural-intellectual effort to transform Chinese society by an attack on Chinese traditionalism and a promotion of Western liberal-bourgeois ideas. From the time of the May Fourth Incident, several members of the magazine became committed to Marxism. The growing Marxist orientation of the magazine led to a split between its liberal and Marxist members in 1921, after which it was an organ of China's first Marxists until it ceased publication in 1926.

The emphasis in the thesis is on the process by which Marxism came to be accepted and interpreted by a crucial section of the May Fourth intellectuals, and the subsequent ideological conflict in the early 1920s between the Marxists and other radical intellectuals.

A tentative perspective on the May Fourth Movement is put forward in the concluding chapter, in which it is suggested that the movement, though being one of several nationalism-motivated efforts at "modernisation" in modern Chinese history, was qualitatively different from the

earlier attempts in that its participants not only sought throughout for a solution beyond the Chinese cultural horizon, but also resorted to direct political action in its later stage. It was in such a context that Marxism took root in China.

Preface.

The Hsin ch'ing-nien magazine offers rich historical materials for the student of the May Fourth Movement. Apart from the important part it played, its founding in September 1915 predated that of all the other important progressive periodicals of the movement, and when it ceased publication in July 1926, it had also had one of the longest periods of publication. (See Appendix E for the dates of all issues of the magazine.)

A remarkable number of the leading radical intellectuals of the time were associated with the magazine. Its founder and first editor was Ch'en Tu-hsiu, who in July 1921 was co-founder with Li Ta-chao of the Chinese Communist Party and its first Secretary-General until August 1927. Its editor from June 1923 was Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai , who also succeeded Ch'en as party leader in 1927. Li Ta-chao, now regarded by Chinese Communist historians as the pioneer of Marxism in China, was also an active member, as was Hu Shih, China's leading liberal intellectual in the post-May Fourth decades. In its development from a magazine advocating liberal- bourgeois ideas to an official organ of the CCP, Hsin ch'ing-nien itself both reflected and contributed to the crucial changes that took place in the Chinese intellectual and political scene during its period of existence.

The first phase of the magazine is looked at in Chapter 2, while Chapter 3 analyses the vital transitional period from the time of the May Fourth Incident in 1919 to early 1921 when the liberals finally parted company with the Marxists. Chapter 4 deals with the Marxist phase of the magazine, while Chapter 5 examines the polemics in the early 1920s between

the Marxists and other radical intellectuals. The appendix provides biographical notes on the personnel associated with the magazine, and surveys both a selection of periodicals in the May Fourth period and the other periodicals published by the Chinese Communists in the early 1920s.

I have used in my research the complete photo-fascimile edition of Hsin ch'ing-nien which was brought out by the Daian Company of Tokyo in 1962. In this edition, the pagination in the original issues of the magazine is supplemented by a new pagination system. I have used the original pagination throughout the following text, despite the fact that in some issues (particularly the early ones), for some unexplained reason, the sequence of pagination is not continuous, but starts anew with each article.

Hsin ch'ing-nien is abbreviated as HCN throughout the text. In the footnotes and bibliography, HCN 4/1 (Jan.1, 1918), for example, refers to Volume 4, Number 1 of the magazine published on that date.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: THE BACKGROUND IN WHICH HCN WAS FOUNDED.

1. China in 1915.

In 1915 the new republic of China was four years old. But already a section of those concerned with the country's political future felt that the 1911 Revolution had not resolved, and would not be able to resolve, the many basic ills of the country.

Internally, party politics were under the manipulation of the warlords and fell far short of the expectations of those who had pinned their hopes on the republican revolution in bringing democracy to the nation's political affairs. In 1914 Parliament was dissolved and the constitution suspended by Yüan Shih-k'ai. The months from the winter of 1915 to the summer of 1917 saw two attempts at the restoration of the monarchy. Thereafter, while the country fell into spheres of influence of various warlords, power in the central government was left in the hands of Tuan Ch'i-jui 段祺瑞, the leader of the Anfu Club (An-fu chü-lo-pu 安福俱樂部), a grouping of warlords, parliamentarians and bureaucrats with Japanese financial support. In 1917 Sun Yat-sen set up a rival military government in Canton, and there followed a period of indecisive civil wars between the North and the South, broken intermittently by fruitless negotiations in Shanghai.(1)

For the masses of the Chinese people, parliamentary democracy was still an unfamiliar process of government; in fact, few were even aware of its existence. The tradition remained one of obedience to authority, armed might, and the traditional ethical and political dogmas. Such political chaos and backwardness convinced some that a more fundamental solution was called for. In their view , a prime reason for

the political backwardness of the Chinese people was the grip of traditionalism, in particular that of Confucianism, on the minds of the people. There were ample reasons for these anti-Confucianists to see a link between Confucianism and political power. Several societies and periodicals advocating Confucianism were established to support the monarchical movement, while Yüan Shih-k'ai, by a decree in 1913, gave Confucianism privileges not enjoyed by other creeds. The struggle over Confucianism in the political sphere did not disappear with the death of Yüan; in 1916, K'ang Yu-wei petitioned the government to decree Confucianism the state religion in the country's constitution. But as we shall see later (Chapter 2), this met with the strong opposition of the new intellectuals who had by then raised high their anti-Confucian banner.

For the general public, the most obvious failure of the government was the humiliation of China in foreign affairs, particularly at the hands of Japan. National pride had already been dented by China's defeat by Japan in 1894. The cries of "save the nation" (chiu-kuo 救國) were heard even louder when Japan served on the government the notorious Twenty-one Demands in January 1915. Such humiliation reinforced the conviction of many that it was essential that they themselves should take up the task of national salvation, and not leave it in the hands of politicians. This mistrust of politicians further deepened from the end of 1916, when the Japanese government started its new policy of giving financial support to the Peking government in order to win influence with it. The Tuan Ch'i-jui government in turn needed such financial support in its attempt to unify the country by force of arms. As the relations between Tuan's government and Japan grew more and more intimate, first in financial and then in

military matters, so the public became more and more disillusioned with the Peking government. Thus in May 1918, when it was revealed that Tuan had conceded further military influence in China to Japan, there were demonstrations by students, and a number of merchants petitioned the Peking government in protest.(2)

The events of 1915 and 1918, with their demonstration of public indignation over the government's ineptness in foreign affairs, were forerunners of the May Fourth Incident. The later alliance of students, new intellectuals, merchants and workers was already emerging. On the political front, the Kuomintang in the early stage of the May Fourth Movement did not give its support as a party, but some of its members participated as individuals, and some of these, such as Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei 蔡元培 and Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung 錢玄同 , played important roles in the movement. In addition, the new intellectuals were to enjoy the support of the moderate Study Clique (Yen-chiu she 研究社).

On the socio-economic front, the Chinese agrarian economy had long since lost its vitality and stability. Industrialisation had taken its first tentative step in the 1860s, but up till the First World War, its development was hampered by the domination of the home market by the better-produced foreign imports, as well as by the commercial privileges that the Great Powers had extracted from China. It was not until the First World War, during which there was a reduction in foreign imports, that the native industry was able to make any appreciable impact on the home market. These years saw a spurt in the development of such industries as textiles and flour-milling. A modern-form economy was emerging with the establishment of banks on the Western model, and there was also

a tendency towards capital concentration with the introduction of joint-stock companies. Concomitant with these developments was a shift towards investment in industry, commerce and other financial enterprises. These years saw the emergence of new social groups — an urban bourgeoisie and a proletariat — and the subsequent rapid increase in urban population.(3)

But in the countryside, the power of the landed gentry was far from destroyed. Since the 1850s, there had been a progressive militarisation of rural society in the growth of gentry militia, and the gentry were now even more independent of the central government. On the other hand, the abolition of the old civil service examination in 1905 had closed a venue for social advancement for many ambitious young men. These young men from the countryside, as well as a large number of dispossessed peasants, turned to the growing coastal cities for employment opportunities. Urban workers and the patriotic strikes organised by them were later to play an important role in the May Fourth protest in putting teeth into the protests initiated by other groups. In addition, many of them had come from the countryside and returned home periodically, and were consequently able to widen the horizons of at least some people in China's vast hinterland, thanks to their experience in the more developed cities.(4)

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the socio-economic forces briefly described above were productive of consciously-felt changes in Chinese society. In this period of great social flux, which Mary Wright had described as "the first phase of the Chinese revolution" (5), many had hoped that the new republican government would be able to put the nation's affairs in order and remedy her weakness with respect to the foreign powers. But when it became apparent

that the new republic was not only unable to tackle the existing problems, but had in fact created new ones, some came to the conclusion that something more fundamental than a change in state-form had to be attempted. The people who were to play a catalytic part in the subsequent attempt that was the May Fourth Movement were the new intellectuals of China.

This group grew out of the cultural impact of Western penetration on China since the latter half of the nineteenth century. In 1907, two years after the abolition of the imperial civil service examination, Western-style education began to take root and develop in China. Between 1912 and 1917, about 5,500,000 people had graduated, or were attending the new-style schools in China.(6) This new education system produced students who were much less steeped in the traditional ideology.

During and after the First World War, sentiments of nationalism and democracy were other new influences from the West. The early twentieth century saw the departure of an increasing number of Chinese students to further their studies abroad, and on their return, they brought with them new ideas for change, such as parliamentary democracy, women's suffrage and industrial democracy. Among the leaders of the new intellectuals, for example, Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Hu Shih, Lu Hsün and Li Ta-chao had all studied abroad. (Appendix A provides biographical notes on the more important personnel associated with HCN in its period of publication from 1915 to 1926.) When the new intellectuals embarked on the New Culture Movement to transform China after the Western image, their belief was that the 1911 Revolution only succeeded in establishing a republic in form, but in essence there was little of democratic politics within the republican shell. Their proposed remedy

was to spread the principles of democracy and other new ideas to the people, to involve them in the democratic process, and thus transform Chinese society. By the same token, these new intellectuals felt that traditional Chinese morals and ethics of heirarchy and obedience would hamper their task to transform China; so part of the work was the attack on traditional ideologies, and in particular on Confucianism.

2. The State of Chinese Periodicals in 1915.

Lo Chia-lun 羅家倫, a founder-editor of the New Tide (Hsin ch'ao 新潮) magazine, described four categories of periodicals in the early May Fourth period.(7) Firstly, the periodical publications put out by the government, which were without exception heavy and bureaucratic in form, and mostly records of official goings-on. The second category consisted of magazines produced by students in secondary schools or universities. Lo did not include in this category the many new student magazines that were established in the May Fourth period, but reserved it for what one might call student-style magazines, informal and light-hearted in style, and generally about the trivial events of school-life. The third category comprised popular magazines for the general reader, with a varied array of topics in their contents. The fourth consisted of the journals of opinion: those supporting the traditional ideology and those advocating new ideas.

Lo was writing in April 1919, and his description held true for the world of periodicals in China four years earlier, except for the fourth category of the journals of opinion. HCN was founded in September 1915, and at that time there was no lack of conservative periodicals, but there were only a handful of periodicals that advocated anything akin to the ideas of

the subsequent New Culture Movement.

The most noteworthy of these was the Tiger Magazine (Chia-yin tsa-chih 甲寅雜誌), a monthly established by Chang Shih-chao in Tokyo in May 1914. It advocated a liberal constitutional government, and opposed the monarchical movement of Yüan Shih-k'ai, who succeeded in getting the Japanese government to suppress the magazine in 1915. Before he founded HCN and during his brief stay in Japan, Ch'en Tu-hsiu had helped on the Tiger Magazine. Li Ta-chao, Wu Yü 吳虞 and Kao I-han 高一涵, all later contributors to HCN, also wrote for the magazine. Chang Shih-chao himself, however, changed his views in 1916 and became an opponent of the New Culture Movement. During its short period of publication, the influence of the Tiger Magazine was limited by the fact that it was published in Tokyo.(8)

Among the several other progressive periodicals in 1915 was Great China (Ta Chung-hua 大中華), a monthly founded in Shanghai in January 1915 by the moderate Progressive Party (Chin-pu tang 進步黨). Its aim was "to introduce world knowledge, to improve citizen's moral quality, and to discuss current affairs and suggest policies".(9) Science (K'o-hsüeh 科學) was a monthly founded in January 1915 by the Chinese Science Society (Chung-kuo k'o-hsüeh she 中國科學社), the membership of which consisted mostly of scientists and returned students from the United States. The aim of the magazine was "to study theoretical and applied sciences, to popularise scientific knowledge, and to promote industrialisation".(10) "The World's Chinese Students' Journal" was a bimonthly founded in the summer of 1915 by the World's Chinese Students' Federation (Huan-ch'iu Chung-kuo hsüeh-sheng hui 環球中國學生會), an organisation comprising mostly returned students. Its aim was "to introduce and popularise learning and scholarship in the

whole country in order to exchange knowledge with others and promote culture".(11)

Other magazines that existed at the time of the founding of HCN included the "Eastern Miscellany" (Tung-fang tsa-chih 東方雜誌) and the Short Story Monthly (Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao 小說月報). Their readership was more general, and their contents and viewpoints were both varied in nature. Eastern Miscellany was a fortnightly founded in 1904, and when it ceased publication in 1949, was China's longest-lived magazine. Short Story Monthly was later reorganised in January 1921 and became the organ of the Society for Literary Studies (Wen-hsüeh yen-chiu hui 文學研究會), an organisation that supported the new literature movement. (12)

The lack of progressive publications in 1915 was not confined to periodicals. When Hu Shih returned from the United States in the summer of 1917, he searched in vain for worthwhile books in the bookshops of Shanghai. All he could find was a book on Chinese philosophy, which wholeheartedly accepted the traditional ideology. Later he recalled this experience.

> In general, the world of publishing in Shanghai, and that in China, has not produced a book in the last seven years that is worth reading. Not only there is not a single book on advanced learning, but one cannot even find a book to read for pleasure while travelling. When I discovered this peculiar situation, I felt like bursting into tears. At present, when the Chinese people are hungry, there are still charities that give them congee. But for those who are intellectually hungry, there is absolutely nothing to eat.(13)

The field of newspaper publishing at this time was also in the doldrums. This decline was a direct result of governmental suppression. Immediately after the 1911 Revolution, the number

of newspapers had mushroomed. There were nearly five hundred dailys , Peking alone having fifty. This number, however, declined rapidly as a result of the stringent press laws brought in by Yüan Shih-k'ai. Consequently, in the two years 1913-1915, the total circulation of newspapers decreased from 42 to 39 million.(14) The following is a selection of some of the more important newspapers in 1915.(15)

Peking Press (Ching pao 京報) was founded in 1906, later suppressed by Tuan Ch'i-jui, and then re-established in 1916.

National Daily (Kuo-feng jih-pao 國風日報) was established in 1911, and suppressed in 1915 for its opposition to Yüan Shih-k'ai's monarchical movement.

Citizens' Gazette (Kuo-min kung-pao 國民公報) was an organ of the Study Clique, and founded about 1900-1901.

New Public Opinion Daily (Hsin min-i pao 新民意報) was founded in 1912, and then also suppressed in 1915 for its opposition to Yüan.

"The China Times" (Shih-shih hsin-pao 時事新報) was founded in 1908 and also an organ of the Study Clique.

Republican Daily (Min-kuo jih-pao 民國日報) was an organ of the Kuomintang and founded in 1915.

These were the major newspapers in China at the time of the founding of HCN in September 1915. Many of the leaders of the New Culture Movement, including the editors and main contributors of HCN, had either edited or written for these newspapers. The more outspoken of these newspapers were suppressed by the government, and it was from this time on that the magazine form of publication became the more widely-used vehicle for anti-government criticism and the propagation

of new ideas. However, some of the newspapers mentioned above were re-established later on in the May Fourth period, and became effective supporters of the movement.

But in the years immediately following the 1911 Revolution, much of the anti-government criticism in the press was quickly silenced by the Peking government. In this context, it is worth noting the practice of cheng-lun in the press. Cheng-lun 政論 literally means "political commentary", and had been an established feature of Chinese newspapers for a long time, serving as a reflection of public opinion at large outside of official publications. The People's Press (Min pao 民報) published by the colleagues of Sun Yat-sen was a good example of this tradition. But with Yüan Shih-k'ai's suppression of the press, this tradition degenerated into something quite different. During these years, as far as the practice of cheng-lun was concerned, there were two types of press in China. The first did not have any particular political stand, and were not even consistent over one particular issue or figure, but varied their opinion according to the pressures applied or favours offered. The second type made cheng-lun into an irregular feature in their pages, and when an editorial did appear, it was often of only two or three hundred words and quite ineffectual.(16)

The reason for this state of affairs was not difficult to see. Between 1912 and 1914, Yüan Shih-k'ai pushed through the Parliament he controlled a series of laws and regulations that severely restricted civil rights in all spheres. The first of these was the Emergency Law passed in December 1912.(17)

This was further reinforced in 1914 by the imposition of the Security and Police Regulation in March (18), the Press Regulation a month later (19), and lastly the Publication Law in December (20). By these laws, the president or the local military commander could declare a state of emergency, and bring under control the citizens' freedom of movement, speech and association. The police further had the power to control all political associations and their publications. All publications had to be registered with the police with a deposit of money, and approved by them before circulation.

Such restrictions on progressive periodicals continued throughout the May Fourth period. In later years, with the springing up of numerous new periodicals, the government of course found it difficult to suppress all of them. But the more important ones did not escape the attention of the police. In 1921, for example, the manuscripts for an issue of HCN were seized by the secret police in Shanghai. The authorities further prohibited the printing of the magazine in Shanghai. Eventually the magazine was printed in Canton, and the date of publication was delayed by two months.(21)

These were then the conditions of publication under which HCN was founded in 1915 by Ch'en Tu-hsiu. There were only a few progressive magazines at the time, and they all had only limited influence. The more influential newspapers that criticised the government were quickly closed down. In Chapter 2 Section 7 we shall see the impact of HCN on the journalistic world.

CHAPTER 2. THE LIBERAL-BOURGEOIS PHASE OF HCN, September 1915 - April 1919.

1. The Publication of HCN.

Ch'en Tu-hsiu was first involved in the republican movement while he was studying in Hangchow in the late 1890s, and took part in the revolution in 1911. Following Yüan Shih-k'ai's usurpation of power and the fai

> which, in Ch'en's own words, would "create a great impact". I then introduced him to

in 1913, in which he also took Ch'en Tzu-pu 陳子佩 and Ch'en Tzu-shou 陳子壽, was during his brief stay in Japan that Ch'en first expressed the idea that a democratic transformation of the minds of the Chinese people would be the prerequisite for any improvement in the country's situation. (See following section.)

On his return from Japan in the summer of 1915, Ch'en set about to prepare the launching of a new magazine that would contribute towards a re-education of the Chinese people. He discussed the idea with Wang Meng-tsou 汪孟鄒, the son of one of his former class-mates and the manager of the East Asia Bookshop (Ya-tung t'u-shu-kuan 亞東圖書館) in Shan

> East Asia Bookshop (Ya-tung t'u-shu-kuan 亞東圖書館) in
>
> In 1915 Ch'en Tu-hsiu came to Shanghai from Anhwei, and was intent on starting a magazine, which, in Ch'en's own words, would "create a great impact". I then introduced him to Ch'en Tzu-pu 陳子佩 and Ch'en Tzu-shou 陳子壽, two brothers who were managing the Public Welfare Bookshop (Chün-i shu-she 群益書社).(2)

The first issue of Youth Magazine (Ch'ing-nien tsa-chih 青年雜誌) came out on September 15, 1915. The name of New Youth (Hsin ch'ing-nien 新青年) was adopted from September 1916. Initially the magazine was both edited and printed in Shanghai. However, with Ch'en's appointment as the Dean of the Faculty of Letters at Peking University in early 1917, the editorial work was done in Peking, while the printing continued to be done in Shanghai.

During the years 1915-1919 inclusive, six volumes of the magazine were published, with six numbers to each volume. The numbers in the first volume appeared in monthly intervals following the first number in September 1915, with the last one appearing in February 1916. There was a gap of six and half months between the first and second volumes, with the first number of the second volume not appearing till September 1916, due to "various reasons" which were unspecified.(3) The issues of the second and third volumes then appeared regularly every month, with the last number of the third volume appearing in August 1917. Then there was another unexplained gap of five and a half months until the first number of the fourth volume appeared in January 1918. The issues of the fourth, fifth and sixth volumes then appeared regularly every month, except for the last number of the sixth volume which was delayed for six months due to the May Fourth Incident. One of the reasons for these occasional delays in publication was the fact that from the winter of 1917, the magazine was edited in Peking and printed in Shanghai, and the printer was slow to put the manuscripts to print, "so that freshly-written articles sometimes became stale by the time they appeared in print".(4)

According to Wang Meng-tsou, with whom Ch'en Tu-hsiu had first discussed the production of HCN, the initial sales of HCN were "very low"; the circulation was one thousand for each issue, including complimentary copies. From 1917 on, however, sales began to increase and reached fifteen to sixteen thousand copies.(5) A different source gives a much higher figure for HCN's circulation: the first issue alone was reprinted several times and sold more than 200,000 copies.(6) It seems fair to say that after its first two years, the circulation of HCN was quite considerable, relative

to other magazines and considering the dismal conditions for publication of the time. However, there is no doubt that, as will be described in Section 7, the magazine was very enthusiastically received by its readers. The reprinting that was done was likely to have been due to the demand of new readers for back-issues. In October 1918, for example, HCN was able to advertise in the last number of the fifth volume, that it would be bringing out, one and a half years from then, a complete set of the first five volumes of the magazine.(7) The same advertisement also gave the postal rates for sending sets of the back-issues to Japan and "other countries", thus indicating the existence of an overseas readership. In fact, quite a number of HCN's overseas readers, upon their return to China, became contributors to the magazine. HCN was available for sale in most parts of China, including the larger towns in the less developed parts of the country. An advertisement carried by the magazine in January 1920, listed eighty bookshops in all parts of the country that sold the magazine.(8)

One of the reasons that made HCN such an influential periodical of the May Fourth period was that its editors and main contributors were all leading members of the new intelligentsia and literary hero-figures of the time. By the time they became involved with HCN, many of them had made a name for themselves in their respective fields, and this was reflected in the informal division of labour in the pages of the magazine. Before Ch'en Tu-hsiu assumed his appointment at Peking University in early 1917, HCN was very much a one-man effort on his part. During this period, he edited the magazine in Shanghai, and the relationships between the new intellectuals were loose and informal. In the first volume

(September 1915 to February 1916), the only other major contributor besides Ch'en was Kao I-han.

From the second volume (September 1916 to February 1917), we find two new contributors who were to become important figures on HCN: Li Ta-chao and Hu-Shih. Li's first contribution to HCN was in September 1916. One source claims that at the time of this article, Li was already an active member of the magazine.(9) He was however in Peking at this time , so it seems likely that the editorial relationship between him and Ch'en at this time was an informal one — that of Li being asked by his friend Ch'en to write an article for the magazine. This is borne out by the fact that Li's second contribution to HCN came nine months after the first. Hu Shih's first contribution to HCN consisted of a translation of a short story, "The Duel" by the Russian writer Nikolai Teleshov, and which he submitted to the magazine while still a student in the United States.(10) His second contribution created much more interest. In October 1916, he wrote to Ch'en in the magazine's "Correspondence" (T'ung-hsin 通信) column, commenting on an article written by Ch'en in November 1915 on a history of European literature. But the more important part of Hu's letter consisted of an outline of proposals for literary reform.(11) Ch'en replied enthusiastically to Hu's letter and encouraged him to pursue this discussion further.(12) Hu subsequently expanded his outline into an essay which was published in the magazine in January 1917.(13) This created considerable interest and response from HCN's readers,and it was from this time on that Hu Shih became a regular contributor. Upon his return to China in the summer of 1917, he quickly became an active member of the magazine.

The last two numbers of the second volume of HCN appeared

respectively in January and February 1917. By this time, Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, another leading intellectual figure of the time, had been appointed chancellor of Peking University, and his subsequent reforms at the university were to be significant not only to the coalescence of the HCN group, but also to the New Culture Movement as a whole. At the time of his appointment, Peking University was regarded as the leading academic institution in China, but at the same time its professors and students had the poor reputation of a low standard of morals in their gambling activities and association with prostitutes. The professors, most of whom came from officialdom, were not judged so much by their academic merit as by their official rank. The students in turn regarded their academic studies as a stepping-stone to officialdom. On taking office, Ts'ai soon increased the university's budget and enlarged its enrolment. But more importantly, Ts'ai put into effect various liberal and progressive measures. Many professors with progressive views were appointed, students were permitted to take part in political activities as individuals, and they were also encouraged to start various enterprises such as a work-and-study programme for poor students. Generally a spirit of equality prevailed in the university, and the previous barrier between professors and students was to a large extent broken down.(14)

From HCN's point of view, the most important of Ts'ai's reforms was the gathering together of many of the new intellectual leaders. With Ch'en's appointment as the Dean of the Faculty of Letters in early 1917, these progressive professors quickly became associated with the magazine. The following is a list of these professors at Peking University, and how each became associated with HCN.

Kao I-han. Mention has already been made that Kao began to

write for HCN from its first volume. At the time of Ch'en's appointment to Peita, Kao was a professor of political science at the university.

Li Ta-chao. Li had also contributed to HCN before Ch'en came to Peita. From February 1918, Li was the Chief Librarian at the university, and later concurrently a professor of social sciences.

Hu Shih. Hu was appointed a professor of philosophy upon his return from the United States in the summer of 1917.

Liu Fu 劉復. Liu had also started to write for HCN before Ch'en's appointment. From 1917, Liu taught in the pre-undergraduate section of the university.

T'ao Meng-ho 陶孟和. T'ao was a professor of social sciences at the time. His first contribution to HCN consisted of a long article in January 1917 on the origins of human civilisation.(15)

Wu Yü. Before he came to Peita in 1919, Wu's first contact with Ch'en was in 1915 when Ch'en published some of his poems in the Tiger Magazine. In January 1917 Wu wrote to HCN, supporting its anti-Confucian stand (16), and the first of his anti-Confucian essays for HCN was published the following month.

Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, Chancellor of the university. In January 1917 Ch'en published in HCN, without Ts'ai's knowledge, the texts of two speeches by Ts'ai in which the latter attacked the idea of establishing Confucianism as a state religion. Ts'ai subsequently wrote to HCN to make some textual corrections to the two speeches and also to elaborate on several points.(17) Later, Ts'ai himself sent in another speech to HCN, which was published in August 1917. His first essay

for HCN appeared in May 1918.

Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung. A well-known professor of linguistics at Peita, Ch'ien was first attracted to HCN by Hu Shih's article on literary reform, which was published in the magazine in January 1917 and referred to earlier. From the next issue, Ch'ien began a series of letters to HCN's "Correspondence" column, supporting the ideas for literary reform proposed by Hu and Ch'en.(18)

Chou Tso-jen 周作人. Chou taught at the university from April 1917. His first contribution to HCN was in January 1918.

Lu Hsün 魯迅. Lu Hsün did not join Peita until 1920, but before that he had been working in Peking at the Ministry of Education. In 1918, he was persuaded to write for HCN, and this he later recalled.

> The editors of HCN came to press me again and again until I wrote something. And here I must remember Mr. Ch'en Tu-hsiu who was the one who urged me the most strongly to write.(19)

His first contribution was in May 1918, in the form of his famous short story, "Diary of a madman".

Fu Ssu-nien 傅斯年. Fu was a student at the university. His first contribution to HCN consisted of an essay on literary reform in January 1918. In January 1919, Fu and others founded the New Tide magazine. (See Appendix B.)

Shen Yin-mo 沈尹默. Shen taught in the Faculty of Letters at the university. His contributions to HCN all came in the form of vernacular verses, the first of which appeared in January 1918.

Wang Hsing-kung 王星拱. A professor of science at Peita, Wang was one of the first scholars in China to

study the scientific method. His first contribution to HCN was in April 1918.

With this group of outstanding new intellectuals gathered together at Peking University, it was not surprising that Ch'en moved the editorial work of HCN to Peking early in 1917. At this time, these intellectuals had already formulated similar views about Chinese society and the belief in the need for its transformation. Thanks largely to Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei's reforms at the university, they were now geographically close to each other. At the same time, Ch'en Tu-hsiu's HCN gave shape and form to their ideas, and provided a forum by which they could communicate with the public, particularly the country's youth.

In January 1918 an editorial committee for HCN was established. This consisted of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Hu Shih, Li Ta-chao, Shen Yin-mo, Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung and Kao I-han, who took turn between themselves to edit the magazine from January 1918 on. The editorial committee met once a month, and invited by letter to their meeting other main contributors such as Lu Hsün, Chou Tso-jen and Liu Fu.(20) The close cooperation between them was reflected in the pages of the magazine. An article by one was often appended with a note by another, and there was a considerable amount of correspondence between them on various subjects in the "Correspondence" column.

There was also a noticeable delineation of subjects among the new intellectuals according to their various interests and training. On literary reforms, Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung concentrated on the question of phonetics, Hu Shih and Liu Fu on the promotion of a vernacular literature, while Chou Tso-jen made various translations from European literature and Shen Yin-mo's speciality lay in the composition of light vernacular verses. In the attack on Chinese tradition, Wu Yü made incisive re-evaluations of the ancient classics; Ts'ai

Yüan-p'ei's interest lay in educational reforms, while Lu Hsün and Li Ta-chao respectively used short stories and essays to make comments on the mentality of their countrymen. Li Ta-chao, together with Kao I-han, also concentrated on the introduction of Western political and social theories, while Wang Hsing-kung specialised in the promotion of the scientific and logical method. As for Ch'en Tu-hsiu, one could say he was a jack of all trades and master of many. All in all, in the words of Liu Fu,

> Each of us has his speciality, and each of us tries his best.(21)

2. The Original Conception Behind HCN: the Transformation of Thought.

Ch'en Tu-hsiu's view of Chinese society at the time he founded HCN was expressed by him in an article in April 1915 in the Tiger Magazine. In this article, "Patriotism and self-consciousness",he argued that these two forces were the necessary ingredients that went towards the making of a modern nation, but he saw the absence of these two forces in Chinese society. If anything, he went on, the kind of patriotism that existed in China was an aberrant one. Whereas the patriotism that existed in the West was based on constitutional rights and the citizens' belief that the state was a public institution through which everyone should benefit, the Chinese form of patriotism was based on the belief that the state was justifiably the property of a privileged few to whom the rest should give their complete loyalty and obedience. This form of blind patriotism without self-consciousness, Ch'en believed, meant the perpetual enslavement of the people. Thus what China needed first was knowledge and self-consciousness, and then and only then could patriotism become a positive force in Chinese society.(22)

Ch'en was writing in 1915, four years after the republican

revolution had taken place, and the bleak picture he painted of contemporary Chinese politics was shared by many of the new intellectuals. They believed that the 1911 Revolution had only given the country an empty republican shell that remained devoid of democratic politics. They believed that what was required was a fundamental re-education of the people in order to bring them into the political process. In 1917 Ch'en Tu-hsiu, in a reply to a letter from a HCN reader, explained the problem facing the country.

> Republicanism is an infinite quality. It is not true that once you have a republican political form, you will also have republican politics. Republican politics can only come about if a majority of the people are attuned to republicanism.(23)

The task of educating the Chinese people, in particular the youth, to prepare them to be citizens of a modern state was what Ch'en and others on HCN had set themselves to do in these first years of the magazine. In its first Manifesto published at the same time as the first number of the magazine in September 1915, the magazine declared such an aim.

> The well-being of our country is in decline, and our learning is in doldrums. The responsibility for the future lies with the youth. The aim of our magazine is to discuss with young people the way to cultivate ourselves and run our country.(24)

This aim was further affirmed by Ch'en in 1916: "The aim of our magazine is to educate the youth, and to work for a basic awakening of our countrymen."(25)

This emphasis on the youth of the country was quite apparent from the beginning. Ch'en Tu-hsiu and others recognised the strength of tradition in Chinese society, and the grip it had on the older generation, and so they pinned their hopes on the youth. In the very first article of the first issue of the magazine, in his celebrated

essay, "Call to youth", Ch'en spoke directly to his young readers.

> What we need is one or two self-aware young people who dare to struggle, who use their natural intellect to judge the divergent thoughts in the world, so as to select the fresh and vital and to reject the old and rotten. You must treat this task as a sharp tool cleaves iron, or as a sharp knife cuts hemp. Never compromise and never hesitate!(26)

Ch'en went on to put forward six principles of action: to be independent and not servile, progressive and not conservative, aggressive and not retiring, cosmopolitan and not isolationist, utilitarian and not formalistic, and scientific and not speculative.(27) In a new year editorial for January 1916, Ch'en once again spoke of his hope for the young: he enjoined them to make a new start, and "to make the year 1916 a watershed in our history".(28)

This hope in the young people of China was shared by others on HCN. In the first issue of HCN, for example, Kao I-han, in an essay entitled "The republic and the self-awareness of youth", also expressed the idea that the future of the country lay in the hands of the young.

> The clearness of a river depends on its source. If we want to transform morality in our country, we must also start from the beginning. Thus it is useless in hoping for cleansing away the poisonous remnants of feudalism from the old. The only hope lies in the young, since they have not been so deeply poisoned, and can attain self-awareness.(29)

In the new intellectuals' campaign for the transformation of thought, apart from the emphasis on youth, the other important aspect was the deliberate avoidance of discussion of concrete political events. As we shall see later (Section 8), this point of editorial policy was in fact later on both consciously and unconsciously violated. But the original intended position on this point was quite clear, as it was declared in 1915 by Ch'en in a reply to a letter from a reader who wrote in to

suggest that HCN should take part in the debate then taking place as to whether China should remain a republic or not. Ch'en's answer to this suggestion was quite specific.

> The duty of this magazine is to change the thought of the youth, and help them to cultivate themselves. Our aim is not to make comments on present-day politics. Our countrymen have yet to achieve a fundamental awareness in their thinking, and this is the reason for their non-participation in politics.(30)

Thus in this period, the HCN intellectuals believed that the transformation of thought was the predominant task that they should be engaged in. Before such a transformation had at least got underway, they argued, it would be pointless to involve themselves in political debate, since this latter action would only be beyond the understanding of the majority of the people, which meant that they would again be left out of the political process of the country. Ch'en, in particular, strongly believed that the main cause for the failure of the republic was that the change in political form was not accompanied by a change in the political mentality of the Chinese people. Writing in 1917, Ch'en explained this point.

> If we now want to consolidate the republic, we must first eradicate all the old and anti-republican thoughts from the minds of the people. This is because the organisation of a country, the social system, and the concept of morality in a democratic republic and a dictatorial monarchy are all diametrically opposed to each other. The former puts the emphasis on the spirit of equality, while the latter emphasised heirarchy. The two cannot co-exist.(31)

The new intellectuals' preoccupation with the transformation of thought and their avoidance of discussion of political issues can be explained by their alienation from, and disenchantment with the contemporary political process. Many of them had participated in, and had entertained great hopes of the republican revolution in 1911. Then followed the usurpation of power by

Yüan Shih-k'ai, two attempts at the restoration of the monarchy, the domination of parliamentary politics by the Anfu Club, and the degeneration into warlordism in the provinces. Such chaos in the political situation was disillusioning to many of the new intellectuals, and many of them opted for a rejection of formal political commitments. When in 1916 Ch'en Tu-hsiu was criticised for his opposition to political participation, he replied that, "In the absence of constitutional government, politics would only produce tyranny,and political parties inevitably become cliques."(32)

To Ch 'en and others on HCN, the key to a healthy political life did not lie in their direct political involvement, but in the education of the Chinese people in democratic ideals. In an essay entitled "Our final awakening", Ch'en offered the following explanation for the absence of democratic political life in China.

> Dictatorship has existed in our country for a long time. The word of the official is law, and apart form paying their taxes and sending in petitions, the people have no contact with the government. ..... This state of affairs has come down through the ages, and is the cause of the present plight of our country. Most of the merchants and other people feel that politics are not any of their concern, and so they leave changes in the hands of the govern-ment and the political parties. They adopt an attitude of neutrality, as if they are only observing a fire that is raging only on the other side of a river. They do not know that the country is their property,and that a man is a political animal.(33)

Ch'en then went on to propose three closely-related ways to bring about a political awakening. The first was the adoption of the Western political view that the state was the property of all citizens. The second was a rejection of China's age-old tradition of bureaucratic and oligarchical rule. The third was the introduction and implementation of the

ideals of republicanism and constitutionalism so they would become the political motivations of the majority of the people.(34)

A point of discussion in this description of the original conception behind HCN in these years is whether Hu Shih, who in early 1921 left the magazine because he thought it too political, had any decisive influence on the editorial position of HCN at this time. In an interview with Jerome Grieder held in Taiwan in 1960, Hu suggested that the HCN group adhered to its apolitical stand "out of deference to his opinions".(35) While Hu Shih was undoubtedly an important figure on HCN, it was unlikely that he was the main architect of the magazine's policy in this period. He only worked on HCN actively after he had returned to China in the summer of 1917, nearly two years after the magazine had been founded. Ch'en Tu-hsiu was also twelve years his senior.

Hu Shih's interest and concern in the New Culture Movement were largely involved with literary reforms. And although his work in the literary field was a great fillip to the literary revolution, Ch'en Tu-hsiu had also long been interested in literary reforms which he regarded as an essential part of the transformation of thought of the Chinese people. As we have seen above, the avoidance of direct political involvement of HCN was a deliberate choice by Ch'en himself, and had been so before Hu Shih returned from the United States. Grieder also supports the view that HCN's apolitical stand in its first years was laid down by Ch'en, but points out that Hu's strong views on the subject might have served to maintain this stand.(36) As will be described in Section 8, points of strain did exist in the collaborative effort of HCN's intellectuals in this period, and eventually went towards the split in 1921. But the overall impression one gets from a perusal of HCN in this period was

a group of like-minded intellectuals working together in an atmosphere of euphoria and urgency in their collective attempt of a transformation of the thought of their countrymen. We will now first examine their attack on Chinese tradition, then their promotion of new ideas and the related literary revolution.

3. The Attack on Chinese Tradition.

Before new and Western ideas could be grasped by the Chinese people, the new intellectuals reasoned, the grip of tradition on Chinese people had to be destroyed. In 1916 Ch'en Tu-hsiu put it in the following way.

> If we want to adopt republicanism and constitutionalism, and yet at the same time retain the heirarchical characteristics in our system of morality, the old and the new will not be able to compromise with each other, and there will inevitably be a clash. This is because republicanism and constitutionalism base themselves on the principles of independence, equality and freedom, and are hence mutually exclusive with respect to our heirarchical morals. If we want one, we must reject the other.(37)

In their assault on traditional ideas, the new intellectuals identified their chief enemy as Confucianism and hence their slogan in this period, "Down with Confucius & Sons" (Ta-tao K'ung-chia-tien 打倒孔家店). There had been instances of anti-Confucianism before in Chinese history, but these had either petered out from lack of support, or from suppression by the government. Yen Fu for a time had expressed his doubts of the validity of Chinese tradition, while early Chinese socialists and anarchists had made an even more radical rejection. Wu Yü, an anti-Confucian stalwart on HCN, had had his early anti-Confucian writings banned successively by the Ch'ing court and the republican government.(38)

HCN's opening salvoes on the citadel of tradition consisted of critical comparisons of Eastern and Western civilisations,

and of the old and the new. In such comparisons, the influence of Social Darwinism was clearly discernable, as in Ch'en's opening article, "Call to youth".

> The youth in a society are like the fresh and vital cells in a human body. In the process of metabolism, the old and rotten cells are constantly eliminated and replaced by the fresh and vital cells. ..... As long as such a metabolism takes place, the body will be healthy. But if the old and rotten cells accumulate, the body will die off. Similarly, if metabolism functions properly in a society, it will be strong and prosperous; if not, the old and degenerate elements will fill the society and cause it to die.(39)

In the same issue, in his essay, "The French and contemporary civilisation", Ch'en further made a comparison of ancient and contemporary civilisations.

> The essence of both the Indian and Chinese civilisations are still bound by the old. Although these two civilisations are contemporary ones, they are in fact legacies of the past. The only civilisation that can truly be described as contemporary, is that of the Europeans.(40)

In this initial attack on Chinese tradition, the criticism was made in very general terms. The point of attack was the assertion that traditional Chinese culture was an anachronism in the modern world, and that if it was not replaced by the more progressive and vital Western values, the Chinese nation would be left behind in the modern world. At this stage, Confucianism was yet to be specifically attacked and assessed point by point. For the time being, criticism of Chinese tradition consisted of holding it up in comparison with Western culture. In December 1915, for example, in an essay on "The differences between the basic ideas of the Eastern and Western peoples", Ch'en outlined three main reasons why the West would be much more successful in the modern world than the East. He believed that firstly the West had struggle as a basic

ingredient in its culture, while the East upheld harmony as a virtue; secondly the West had the individual as the basic unit in society, as compared with the family or clan in the East; thirdly the Western people believed in legalism and tangible self-interests, while the Eastern people valued pointless emotions and conventions.(41) Elsewhere, in a similar vein, Ch'en spoke of the the superiority of the practical nature of Western education over the formalistic emphasis in Eastern education.(42)

The first specific attack in HCN on Confucianism came in Ch'en Tu-hsiu's new year article in January 1916. In it, Ch'en criticised the Confucian concept of three bonds (san-kang 三綱), in which the emperor was regarded as the master of his subjects, the father the master of his children, and the husband the master of his wife. He called the adherence to this concept "the morality of slaves", and asserted the importance of an individual's independence.

> In the world today, all actions should be centred on "the self". If one loses this bearing, all is lost. And this morality of slaves loses us this bearing, and leads us to the illusion that we are being virtuous in becoming the property of others.(43)

This initial reference to Confucianism was followed in the next issue in February by a more systematic attack by Yi Pai-sha 易白沙 in the first of two articles on "A discussion of Confucius". In it, he first described how Confucianism became the official dogma during the Han Dynasty, then went on to describe the political implications of the Confucian ideology, such as the identification of the emperor with heaven and the emphasis placed on obedience as a virtue.(44) In the same issue, Ch'en further criticised the heirarchical nature of Confucianism, and stressed that the Confucian concept of

three bonds was the mainstay of the old morality and politics in China, and that it upheld a caste system which would completely contradict the spirit of equality in a republic.(45)

It was from this issue on (February 1916), that HCN's attack on Chinese tradition became progressively intenser, and there were now much more specific essays examining and re-evaluating the various tenets of traditional Chinese ethics and teaching. In the December 1916 issue, for example, Ch'en made the following frontal attack on Confucianism.

> Confucius lived in a feudal age, and the ethics he advocated were feudal ethics. ..... The aim and scope of feudal ethics, rituals, life and politics do not go beyond the privileges of a minority of lords and noblemen, and they do not have anything to do with the happiness of the great majority of people. ..... How can this feudal ideology be of use several thousand years later in today's republican era? (46)

In February 1917 the first of Wu Yü's effective anti-Confucian essays appeared in HCN. In his first contribution, Wu argued that the main reason why China had been left behind by the European countries in the transition out of feudalism was the rigid family system of China. Wu asserted that the idea of the family had inculcated in the minds of the Chinese people the idea of filial piety (hsiao 孝) as a virtue, and this in turn had become the basis of the idea of unquestioning loyalty (chung 忠) to the emperor, and thus helped to maintain dictatorial rule in Chinese history.(47)

Wu Yü's chief contribution to the anti-Confucianism of HCN was that he was much more specific than the others in his criticism. He frequently recounted famous ancient stories of Confucian virtues, and examined them in a new light. At the same time , on a more general level, he also looked at the function of Confucianism in the morals, laws and

institutions of traditional Chinese society. In an article in June 1917, for example, he spoke of the Confucian heirarchical relationship between the emperor and his subjects, father and son, husband and wife, officials and subjects. This distinction between the privileged and the unprivileged, Wu believed, had been responsible for the inequality in Chinese society for the last two thousand years.(48)

In May 1918 Lu Hsün joined the ranks of anti-Confucian writers on HCN. His approach was not that of a theoretical discussion of Confucianism, but of using short, pungent and highly satirical short stories that reflected what he saw as wrong with Chinese society. At this time, the literary practice of short-story writing was not as yet widespread, but Lu Hsün, by his genius for the satirical, quickly won a great number of readers.

His first story, "Diary of a madman" was published in the May 1918 issue of HCN. Through the pages of the madman's diary, Lu Hsün described the various pressures on the individual in traditional Chinese society. In bewilderment and desperation, the madman one day consulted the history books, and was struck by the discovery that they contained no record of historical events, but that "every page was scattered with the words 'benevolence, righteousness and morality'". The madman pondered over this discovery all night, and finally realised that all these words in fact advocated "cannibalism".(49) The very end of the story records the madman's remorse.

> I have been practising cannibalism for the last four thousand years. Unaware at first, I now understand and cannot face a genuine human being. There may still be children who haven't yet become cannibals. Save the children. ..... (50)

The effectiveness of Lu Hsün's anti-traditional writings lies

in his vivid description of how traditional forces and conventions affected the everyday life of the Chinese. The main characters in his stories are all portrayed after what Lu Hsün sees as the average Chinese, with all his failings and weaknesses. The best example of this is of course his "The true story of Ah Q", published in December 1921. From October 1918, he was also a regular contributor to the "Random Thoughts" (Sui-kan lu 隨感錄) column in HCN, which was a short but highly effective feature consisting of short and sharp comments on all manners of things. Here, Lu Hsün's witty and often pungent comments on traditional Chinese society were particularly striking. Giving his opinion on whether China should preserve her "national quintessence" (kuo-ts'ui 國粹) by preserving her traditional culture, he offered the following analogy.

> For example, if somebody has a lump on his face, and his forehead swells with a huge pimple, of course he stands out in a crowd,and we can call that his "quintessence". But as I see it, I'd rather amputate this "quintessence", and be just like anybody else.(51)

In the description of HCN's attack on Chinese tradition so far, emphasis has been placed on the new intellectuals' views on the undemocratic characteristics of Chinese society and tradition. Their criticisms in this respect were complementary to their promotion of"Mr. Democracy"(Te-mo-k'e-la-hsi hsien-sheng 德謨克拉西先生), a term coined by Ch'en to represent the democratic ideas HCN was advocating. The new intellectuals also promoted "Mr. Science" (Sai-yin-ssu hsien-sheng 賽因斯先生), and the complementary to this in their attack on tradition was their iconoclasm and their critique of superstition and other speculative thoughts.

In his opening article "Call to youth" in September 1915, Ch'en Tu-hsiu had enjoined the country's youth to be scientific and not speculative in their thinking.

> What is science? It is our general conception of

> matter. It is the sum of the objective phenomenon and the analysis by subjective reason, and contains no contradictions within itself. What is speculation? It is not part of the objective phenomenon, and goes beyond subjective rationality. It is something created out of thin air, and consists of only hypotheses which lack proofs....Our scholars have no knowledge of science, and so they borrow the yin-yang ideas of auspicious signs and five elements to confuse the world and cheat the people.(52)

One interesting attack on superstition was the debate as to the existence of ghosts. The first of such a discussion was by Ch'en in May 1918, in which he used the scientific method of verification, and put forward various evidence on the non-existence of ghosts.(53) Later on Ch'en turned his attention to an attack on the worship of idols.

> Earthen and hand-carved idols are by themselves useless objects. It is only because some people worship them, burn incense for them, kow-tow to them and say that they possess power, that some ignorant people are led to the belief that they (the idols) have the power to reward the virtuous and punish the sinful. ..... The only reason these idols possess any power is because superstitious people are fooling themselves, and not because the idols have any intrinsic powers. If these idols are not destroyed, there will only be superstition in which these people fool themselves, and there will be no truthful and rational faith. Isn't that pitiful? (54)

At the end of the same article, Ch'en included in the idols that had to be destroyed all the unfair and exploitative worships in religion, politics and ethics in traditional Chinese society.(55)

Another aspect of the attack on tradition was the discussion of the position of women. A column on "The Women Question" (Nü-tzu wen-t'i 女子問題) was started from March 1917, and ran irregularly for ten months. But the discussion of this question was by no means confined to this column. The topics discussed ranged from the inferior position of women in the Chinese family to the discrimination against women in education and employment. Accounts of the women's movements in the West were published to give comparison and inspiration. Particular emphasis was given to the right of free

choice in marriage.(56) The discussion on women was regarded by the HCN intellectuals as an integral part of their critique of tradition. However from the latter part of 1918 on, discussion on this subject appeared less and less frequently. In a reply to a reader's letter, Liu Fu explained that since few readers had come forward to contribute to the discussion, "without knowing it, we seem to have put this question aside."(57)

But HCN's overall attack on Chinese tradition continued unabated during these years, and together with the promotion of new ideas and the literary revolution (which we will now look at in turn), formed the chief components of its editorial policy in this period. The reason for this attack was summed up by Ch'en in an article on "The constitution and Confucianism" in November 1916, in which he reaffirmed the view that the matter of politics was only secondary to the question of ethics. He then went on to stress that Confucianism was the basis of the old ethics and politics (58), and wrote in conclusion:

> If we want to establish a new Western-style society in order to ensure our survival in this age, we then have to import the basis of Western-style society, which is the new belief of the equal rights of man. At the same time, we must fully wake ourselves, and be bravely determined to rid ourselves of Confucianism which cannot co-exist with the new belief, the new society and the new country!(59)

4. The Promotion of New Ideas

Western ideas were first introduced into China on some scale by the translations of Yen Fu. Among his translations, the more important ones were the writings of Thomas Huxley, Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. The ideas of the French Revolution, particularly the ideas of Rousseau, were first popularised by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao at about the same time of Yen's translations. By the time of the New Culture Movement, the list of Western thinkers that had been introduced into China included Kropotkin,

Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Kant and Russell. Their ideas influenced to varying degrees the thinking of the new intellectuals.

In the first issue of HCN, in his essay "The French and contemporary civilisation", Ch'en Tu-hsiu showed his admiration for French culture. He identified three features of contemporary civilisation which, in his opinion, "are important in changing the old, and transforming people and society": the theories of human rights, of evolution, and the idea of socialism.(60) It is interesting to note that after this first and brief discussion of socialism, there was virtually no more discussion of the subject in HCN until the latter part of 1918. This first discussion of socialism by Ch'en, who at this time quite misunderstood the essence of socialism and particularly of Marxism, and the discussion of socialism in HCN in this period, will both be examined later (Section 6). Ch'en's reference to human rights and the evolutionary theory later developed more broadly into the "Mr. Democracy" and "Mr. Science" who came to personify the many new ideas promoted by HCN, and it is under these two broad headings that the description of HCN's promotion of new and Western ideas will be given.

In the first years of HCN, Kao I-han, then a professor of political science at Peking University, wrote many articles in HCN on the liberal and democratic theories of the West. In his first article in September 1915, "The republic and the self-awareness of youth", he echoed Ch'en's sentiment that republicanism could only take root in China if the Chinese people themselves took part in the political process. Kao's ideas as expressed in this essay were an amalgam of the Hobbesian theory of the social contract and Rousseau's "General Will". Kao first affirmed that it should be the

duty of all citizens to concern themselves with public affairs, and that they should "develop their Free Will into a General Will, which will then be the guide to the country's politics." (Kao indeed used the English words "Free Will" and "General Will" in his essay.) (61)

Kao's next article was a point-by-point comparison between the ancient and modern conceptions of the state. Among the differences noted by Kao, were the modern state's recognition of human rights, its representative politics, separation of power, and the freedom of religion.(62) This was followed by an essay in November 1915, in which Kao further discussed the ideas of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau (63), and his translation of the view of A.V.Dicey, the British constitutional writer, on freedom of speech and of the press (64). In later issues, Kao further introduced the writings of Herbert Spencer, and discussed the aim and scope of a democratic electoral franchise.(65) These then were Kao I-han's more specific and specialised discussions of Western political theories.

More generally, HCN's critique of Chinese tradition was imbued with the spirit of Western liberalism with its emphasis on individual freedom and human rights. Thus in their opposition to monarchism and political oligarchy, the new intellectuals proposed democracy, parliamentarianism and civil rights for the citizens. At the same time, the new intellectuals also emphasised the Western concept of individualism. It was pointed out that an important reason why Western civilisation was successful in the modern world was that it provided the individual with an opportunity to realise his full potential, while a Chinese person was hampered by various social restraints.

Ch'en Tu-hsiu, for example, enjoined his readers "to be conquering and not to be conquered" and that they should "never

give up when the odds are aginst them."(66) To Ch'en, the greatest inhibition in Chinese society to the development of individualism was the traditional family system which he believed to be destructive of an individual's self-respect and initiative. He proposed that individualism should take the place of the family system in Chinese society.(67) In an article in February 1918, he further emphasised the importance of individualism, both from the personal point of the individual and from the point of view of providing the creative force in society.

> To achieve one's will and to satisfy one's desires are the basic reasons for the existence of the individual, and they are unchanging. ..... When an individual is alive, he should strive for and enjoy happiness. He should leave such happiness behind in society so that those who come after him can also enjoy it.(68)

The idea of individualism, particularly that of Ibsen, was also of great importance to Hu Shih. When he had the responsibility for editing the June 1918 issue of HCN, he made that issue into a special number on Ibsen. In an introductory article on "Ibsenism", he described Ibsen's opposition to the restraints on an individual in the forms of social mores, religion and law, and went on to assert with approval that "Ibsen's idea of the ideal life is one in which an individual has the opportunity to develop to the full his own potentiality and individuality."(69)

Turning to the promotion of "Mr. Science", Darwinism was the first scientific principle to have a strong influence on the new intellectuals. We have already seen Ch'en Tu-hsiu's reference to the evolutionary theory as one of the three most important elements of modern civilisation. It was recognised by many that a superior aspect of Western civilisation was its progress in science and technology, and that in the

twentieth century, China should discard its spiritual civilisation in favour of the more materialistic civilisation of the West. The discussion of the scientific method began with a translation by Liu Shu-ya 劉叔雅 of Thomas Huxley's essay "On the Advisability of Improving Natural Knowledge".(70) There was the conviction that science would not only destroy superstitious thoughts, but would also bring material benefits to the people. Ch'en Tu-hsiu spoke of this latter point in the following way.

> As the organisation of society becomes more and more complex, and we know more and more of the truths of life, so the need becomes more and more urgent for scientists who are heroes, who will sacrifice themselves, to turn into reality the dreams of former ages, and bring us construction and assistance in our lives.(71)

This belief in the benevolence of science was also shared by Wu Chih-hui 吳稚暉, who believed that a rational and improved management of tools and machines would bring the people more material welfare.(72)

Allied to this interest in science was the emphasis put on the pragmatic and sceptical approach in thinking. This concern was particularly evident in the writing of Hu Shih who was in this respect a follower of Huxley and Dewey, whose influences on him he later recalled.

> Two persons have most influenced my thought: one is Huxley, and the other is Mr. Dewey. Huxley teaches me how to doubt, and not to believe in anything that has not sufficient proof. Mr. Dewey teaches me how to think. He teaches me to be aware of all the immediate questions, to treat all learning and thoughts as hypotheses awaiting verification, and to be aware of the consequences of thinking. These two persons make me understand the nature and aim of the scientific method.(73)

As we shall see later (Chapter 3, Sections 6 & 7), the pragmatism of Dewey was not without its political implications, and was to contribute to the split in the ranks of the new intellectuals. But in this early period of the May Fourth

Movement, what was emphasised was the scientific method vis-a-vis the traditional mode of thinking, and the contention was one between the practical and sceptical approach, and formalism and speculative thought. For example, as early as October 1915, Ch'en Tu-hsiu had advocated realism as an important principle in Chinese education (74), a subject he returned to in July 1917 when he made a comparison of Western and Eastern education.

> Western education emphasises practical, everyday knowledge, while Eastern education emphasises useless supernatural thoughts. ..... If Chinese education really wants to learn from the West, we must abandon the "holy" classics and speculative thoughts, and concentrate on the knowledge of natural sciences and the skills of everyday living.(75)

On the usefulness of learning, the new intellectuals on HCN also showed the influence of Western utilitarianism in their writing, and emphasised the welfare of the community. In the opening article, Ch'en had first described with approval the influence of utilitarianism in European learning and science.(76) The utilitarian notion of the greatest happiness for the greatest number was most clearly seen in an essay by Kao I-han in September 1916.

> Since the purpose of life is the pursuit of happiness, the state should also make that its purpose. Thus the state should work for a compromise among the people, and offer the people legal confines within which they can have the opportunity to seek adequate happiness for themselves.(77)

Thus liberalism, democratic ideas, parliamentarianism, individualism, utilitarianism, Darwinism, scepticism and other scientific methods were some of the many Western ideas promoted in the pages of HCN in this period. A survey of HCN in this period shows that the promotion of these new ideas and the attack on tradition complemented each other in a two-pronged approach in the transformation of thought. In opposing a certain facet of Chinese tradition, the HCN intellectuals always

proposed an alternative to it, and although these two might not appear in the same issue or article, this two-pronged approach was clear enough, and linked together closely enough to have an effective impression on the readers. Thus the magazine was opposed to monarchism and political oligarchy, and proposed democracy, parliamentarianism and liberal ideas. It criticised the traditional ethical concepts of loyalty, filial piety and hcirarchy, and advocated individualism and equality. It was against the traditional family system, in particularly the lowly position of women and arranged marriages, and argued for the independence of the younger generation and love as a basis of marriage. HCN also attacked old superstitions and religious beliefs, and upheld rationality in thought, science and agnosticism.

Apart from the promotion of new ideas and learning from the West, HCN also described the various minor facets of life in the West. An "Around the World" (Shih-chieh shuo-yüan 世界說苑) column ran from October 1915 for a year, and among the topics it described were travelogues and impressions of life in Germany and France. From December 1916 on, the magazine also published extracts from Hu Shih's diary, describing his experiences and impressions of his student life in the United States.(78) Finally, since the magazine was intended for the youth of the country, there were also reports in the first two volumes on the activities of youth organisations in Britain, Germany, France, Japan and the United States.

5. The Literary Revolution

The May Fourth literary reformers believed that a wholesale reform of the Chinese language and literature was essential to achieving their aim of transforming the thought of the Chinese

people. They believed that the classical style of writing excluded the majority of the Chinese people from the benefit of the written word, and stressed that the many restrictions in form and content of the orthodox Chinese literary tradition had to be abolished and replaced by a new and more versatile literature in the vernacular. This new literature, in its diverse forms, would not be restricted to conveying the teachings of past sages, but would be a carrier of the many new ideas of the time. As with the introduction and discussion of new ideas, the various elements of the literary revolution did not all originate from HCN, but again it was with the establishment of the magazine that the people with such embryonic ideas gathered together, and collectively gave shape and form to the new literary movement in the pages of HCN.

The new intellectuals' interest in literary reforms was manifested from the first issue of HCN. This first number began a translation of Ivan Turgenev's novel Spring Floods, while from the second issue on HCN carried a translation of Oscar Wilde's play An Ideal Husband, this latter translation being the first item in the vernacular carried by the magazine.(79)

In November 1915, Ch'en published his essay "A discussion of the history of contemporary European literature". In the introduction, he noted that the development of science had seen a concomitant development in Europan literature and arts, which had progressed from romanticism to realism, and finally to naturalism.(80) In the following issue, he observed that he foresaw the coming of realism in Chinese literature to replace the current tendencies of classicism and romanticism.(81) This brief discussion by Ch'en on Europaan and Chinese literature elicited a response from Hu Shih, who at the time

was still studying in the United States and had just translated a Russian short story for the magazine. In a letter to Ch'en, he supported the latter's advocacy of realism in Chinese literature, but the much more significant part of his letter was his suggestion of an outline for a "literary revolution" in Chinese literature. He oberved that the reason for the sterile state of Chinese literature was that content was always sacrificed for the sake of achieving an elegant style.(82) In the conclusion of his letter, Hu put forward eight proposals in an outline for a reform of Chinese literature. These points later came to be known as "the eight-don'ts-ism ".

> 1. Do not use or quote from the classics.
> 2. Do not use stale, literary cliches.
> 3. Do not use the parallel construction of sentences.
> 4. Do not avoid using everyday, common words and phrases.
> 5. Pay attention to the construction of grammar.
>
> These then are the revolutions in style.
>
> 6. Do not go in for pointless agonising in one's writing.
> 7. Do not imitate the sayings of the ancients, but what one says should be original.
> 8. One should have substance and meaning in what one writes.
>
> These then are the revolutions in content.(83)

Ch'en Tu-hsiu replied to Hu's letter with great enthusiasm, and encouraged him and others to further the discussion in the pages of HCN.(84) In January 1917, the magazine published Hu's essay "Tentative proposals for literary reform", in which he elaborated on the eight points he had put forward in his letter. In retrospect, perhaps the most important of the eight points was the advocacy of the use of the everyday language of the vernacular which Hu believed to be the only fit medium for a "living literature".(85) In a note appended to this article, Ch'en added his support.

> I am very pleased to see the opinion of Mr. Hu, and to see that I am not alone

> in holding this opinion. Vernacular literature will be the mainstream of Chinese literature. I firmly believe and hope for this.(86)

In the following issue (February 1917), Ch'en in an essay boldly entitled "On literary revolution", called for the establishment of a new Chinese literature that would be both expressive and popular. To achieve this end, he called on his readers to come forward and join the ranks of "the army of literary revolution".(87) This army was soon joined by Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung and Liu Fu. Ch'ien was at the time a noted professor of linguistics at Peking University, and his support greatly strengthened the ranks of the literary reformers. His support first came in the form of a series of letters to HCN. Liu Fu lent his support by publishing a long essay on literary reform in the May 1917 issue of the magazine.(88)

As for the conservative scholars who were opposed to the proposed reforms, their opposition was from the beginning quite feeble. Chief among these conservative scholars was Lin Shu 林紓, who, like Yen Fu, was a prolific translator of Western works. But even Lin's initial opposition was a passive one. He only became involved in the literary debate in early 1917 when Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung, in his series of letters to HCN, criticised his use of the classical language in his translations.(89) To this criticism, Lin only replied weakly that the Chinese classical language should, like Latin and Greek in the West, be preserved. Then he added lamely that "I know the reason (why the classical language should be preserved), but I cannot explain it."(90)

This passive response from the opposition was, in a way, disappointing to the new intellectuals, who wanted to arouse public interest by controversy. This was the intention behind

a planted letter in HCN's "Correspondence" column in the March 1918 issue.(91) The letter was written by Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung under the name of Wang Ching-hsüan 王敬軒, and wildly accused the magazine of all kinds of things in promoting literary reforms.(92) These accusations were replied to in a lengthy essay in the vernacular written by Liu Fu, who eloquently and with great satire demolished the objections raised by "Wang Ching-hsüan".(93) Indeed, the "Correspondence" column in HCN was an important platform where the new intellectuals regularly and publicly exchanged their ideas on the literary revolution.

From 1917 on, the effects of the literary reform already began to show. From January, HCN was published entirely in the vernacular, having gone through a gradual transition from the classical to the vernacular since its first issue. In 1918, Hu Shih declared, perhaps a bit prematurely, the death of the classical language, and called for the creation of a living language in the vernacular.(94) The support the vernacular received was such that, after the May Fourth Incident, virtually all the new student magazines that sprang up were published in the vernacular. In the literary world at large, nearly all periodicals and other literary writings also changed to the new medium. By the early 1920s, the vernacular had become both officially and popularly the "national language" (kuo yü 國語).

Understandably, the early emphasis of the literary revolution was put on transforming the aspect of form in Chinese literary practice, and in particular the use of the vernacular. The restrictiveness of the old classical language and the

difficulty the common people had in understanding it, made it obvious that the first step in any literary revolution would be to advocate the use of the vernacular. There were also discussions on the romanisation of the Chinese language, the use of a new system of punctuations, and a brief interest in Esperanto. As the reformers began to consolidate their progress in changing to the vernacular, their attention gradually switched to the question of content. We have already seen Hu Shih's call for the establishment of a new and living Chinese literature. In April 1919, Chou Tso-jen published an essay in HCN in which he proposed that the new literature should also serve as a carrier of new ideas.

> If the Chinese people will not change fundamentally and throw away all old and useless thoughts, no matter whether we use the classical or the vernacular medium, we will not be able to say anything good. ..... Therefore I believe that a reform of the form of writing is the first step in the literary revolution. The reformation of thought is the second step, which is even more important than the first.(95)

The literary reform of the new intellectuals, in both the aspects of form and content, achieved rapid success, helped no doubt by the proliferation of new periodicals in the May Fourth period and the protest movement after May 1919. In literature, the old sterotyped literature was eclipsed by the appearance of new literary forms: short-stories, poetry, drama and novels that were all written in the vernacular. There were also new experiments in literary criticism and literary theory. All these developments brought about a literature that was not only more accessible to the common people, but were also closer to the realities of life and society. The development of a "revolutionary literature" in later years owed its origin and effectiveness to the reforms carried out in this period.

6. The Discussion of Socialist & Marxist Ideas in HCN in This Period.

In the 1911 Revolution, Sun Yat-sen and his colleagues had discussed the idea of socialism. Sun viewed his "Principle of the People's livelihood" (Min-sheng chu-i 民生主義) as a form of socialism suitable for China. However, from its establishment in 1905, the Alliance Society's (T'ung-meng hui 同盟會) discussion of socialism had been vague and inconsistent, and after the success of the republican revolution in 1911, there was a general decline of interest in socialist ideas, preoccupied as the revolutionaries were with the chaotic political events that followed the revolution.(96)

In November 1911 the Chinese Socialist Party (Chung-kuo she-hui tang 中國社會黨) was founded, and under its leader Chiang K'ang-hu 江亢虎 , the party achieved a sizeable membership. It was not, however, a political party, but a self-proclaimed educational body with moderate socialist ideas. Its success, however, was short-lived, as the party was banned by Yüan Shih-k'ai in August 1913.(97)

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, the Chinese intellectuals' lack of interest in Marxism was not due exactly to ignorance of its existence. Many of the Chinese students and exiles in Japan had read the Japanese translations of socialist writings. In 1903, two Japanese accounts of the history and principles of European socialism were translated into Chinese. In 1906, the ten proposals in The Communist Manifesto were translated into Chinese, and together with the biographies of Marx and Engels, appeared in the January issue of The People's Press, the organ of the Allinace Society in Japan. (98) In 1908 the Way of Heaven Journal (Tien-i pao 天義報), an anarchist magazine published by the Chinese students in Japan, carried the translations of the first chapter of

The Communist Manifesto, Engel's introduction to the English edition of the Manifesto, and the second chapter of Engel's The Origin of the Family, Private Property, & the State. In 1912 a translation of Engel's Socialism: Utopian and Scientific was published in the Shanghai periodical New World (Hsin shih-chieh 新世界).(99)

At this time, Chinese translations of Marxist writings were by no means extensive, but they did indicate that Marxism was not an unknown quantity among the Chinese radical intelligentsia. Furthermore, many of them had the linguistic ability to study Marxist writings in Japanese or Western languages, but apparently the ideas did not attract them enough to induce them to pursue the subject further. The small number of translations, let alone of discussions, was itself a reflection of this lack of interest.

The first mention of Marxism in HCN was in Ch'en Tu-hsiu's essay "The French and contemporary civilisation" in the very first issue of the magazine. Ch'en described Marxism as the latest development in European socialist thought, but he himself quite misinterpreted its essence. He believed that the merit of Marxism lay in its making the rulers and wealthy more aware of the strife between labour and capital, and the danger of this strife to society. According to Ch'en, this awareness would lead the rulers and wealthy to work towards harmony between capital and labour, and to provide protection to the workers.(100)

Ch'en and the other new intellectuals were not hostile to Marxist and socialist ideas. However, they were more attracted to the ideas of liberalism which held out the promise of a balance between individual freedom and social equality. Thus they tended rather towards a vague sentiment of universal brotherhood and mutual help. On the other hand, Marxism in its pre-Leninist form must have seemed to them most irrelevant

to the Chinese situation. Orthodox Marxism sees capitalism breaking at its most highly-developed point, and in his scattered discussions of the world's "backward areas", Marx postulated that any progressive developments in a country such as China, could only develop after its "Europeanisation", and then are still dependent on events in the metropolitan areas of capitalism. None of Lenin's creative adaptations of Marxism were as yet well-known in China.

At the same time, even if the new intellectuals were not interested in the ideology of Marxism, they could not have been completely disinterested in the revolutionary movement in Russia. From the time of Sun Yat-sen and the Alliance Society, Chinese radicals had felt a degree of affinity with their counterparts in Czarist Russia, a vast and backward country with problems not unlike those in China. This interest was reflected in HCN's "Record of Foreign Events" (Kuo-wai ta-shih chi 國外大事記) column, which from the September 1916 issue on, carried frequent reports of the developments in Russia. The space in this column in the April 1917 number was entirely devoted to reporting on the February Revolution, and gave a general account of the causes of its occurrence, the course of events, and the make-up and policies of the new government.(101) This interest in Russian affairs was of course of help later in drawing the new intellectuals' attention to the ideological basis of the October Revolution.

In the meantime, Ch'en Tu-hsiu and others held on to their faith in Western bourgeois political thoughts. In an essay in December 1916, Ch'en gave a spirited defence of the institution of private property.

> Economics is the main artery of modern life, and the independence of the individual is

> the main principle of production in economics. This principle also influences the matter of ethics. Therefore the independence in morality, and the concept of private property in economics are mutually dependent, and cannot be separated. Only then can the moral and material aspects of society make great advancements.(102)

When, in the next issue (January 1917), a reader wrote in to suggest that HCN should propagate the ideas of socialism, Ch'en replied that "Since China's industry is not yet flourishing, socialism cannot yet be put into practice."(103)

To Ch'en, the ideas of socialism, which postulated societal progress to be a consequence of the struggle between antagonistic groups, were not suited to the problems of a backward China. To him, the solution lay in a concerted effort by the people to achieve progress by emulating the West. At this time, Li Ta-chao, later the first of the new intellectuals to embrace Marxism, was also not far from this view. In April 1917, he observed that contemporary civilisation and society were respectively based on cooperation and compromise "between the nobles and the ordinary people, the capitalists and the workers, the landlords and the peasants, and the old and the young".(104)

The new intellectuals' faith in Western democracy was further bolstered by their attitude towards the First World War. They were enthusiastic supporters of the war, the Allies' cause, and China's entry into the conflict. They regarded the war as a heroic Anglo-French effort to combat irrationality in international politics. In April 1917, for example, Ch'en Tu-hsiu gave this opinion of the war.

> This great war is unprecedented in history. After it, the reforms and progress in politics, learning and all other aspects will be unheard of in history. ..... The great war is a struggle between monarchism and democracy,

> and a struggle between aggression and humanitarianism in the world. A great deal hangs in the balance on the outcome of the war.(105)

In a similar vein, Ch'en viewed the February Revolution in Russia as a further affirmation of the ideas of democracy and republicanism.(106) This faith in Western democracy remained unshaken by the success of the October Revolution: Ch'en noted in November 1918 that the struggle was still one between "democracy and science" on the one hand, and "dictatorship and superstition" on the other.(107)

Ch'en Tu-hsiu's and Li Ta-chao's advocacy of a common effort by the Chinese people to lift themselves out of political and economic backwardness was shared by others on the HCN. In November 1918, Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei spoke of the necessity that all in society should work.

> Anyone who uses his labour to do beneficial things for others is a worker, regardless of whether he uses his physical or mental power. So the farmer is a worker who plants, a merchant is one who transacts in goods, and teachers, writers and inventors are workers who educate. We are all workers. We ourselves must realise the value of labour.(108)

In the same spirit of communal cooperation, Chou Tso-jen wrote enthusiastically of the New Village Movement in Japan.

> It advocated that all should be engaged in labour, and live cooperatively in a community. On the other hand, it fulfils one's responsibility towards mankind, and on the other it fulfils one's responsibility towards one's self. It gives praise to both cooperation and individuality, and it develops both the spirit of cooperation and the spirit of freedom.(109)

Finally, in the April 1919 issue, the last HCN number before the May Fourth Incident, there was an essay by Wang Kuang-ch'i who exalted the virtue of labour in the following way.

> We should know that Bolshevism is a very new thing, but what it likes to do is to visit the most corrupt of places. Our China will surely be visited by Bolshevism, and when that happens, Bolshevism will bring us many horrifying gifts. If we wish to lessen the extent of this horror, there is only one way and that is

> not to consider oursleves as outside of the world of labour. In other words, we must start to work.(110)

These three selections from the pages of HCN from the end of 1918 to the eve of the May Fourth Incident, are reflective of a sentiment of utopian socialism among the new intellectuals. But what they have extracted from it was not so much its social and economic principles, but the spirit that members of a society should work together in harmony for the good of all. The essence of this sentiment of communal cooperation was not to be found in the principles of Marx.

Thus there was hardly any Marxist influence in HCN in the period from September 1915 to April 1919. Indeed, there were very few discussions of socialism in general, preoccupied as the new intellectuals were with the ideas of "Mr. Democracy" and "Mr. Science". Yet after the May Fourth Incident, HCN's viewpoint was to tend progressively towards socialism and eventually to Marxism. We shall see in the next chapter the development of this progress, but we shall now first turn to the thinking in this aspect of Li Ta-chao, whose process of commitment to Marxism prior to May 1919 was reflected in his writings in HCN.

Li Ta-chao's first expressed interest in socialist ideas was in 1913 when he showed sympathy for Chiang K'ang-hu's moderate Chinese Socialist Party.(111) This first interest further developed during his stay in Japan from 1913 to 1916, when he came into closer contact with more Western socialist theories in his formal course of studies in political science at Waseda University. However, until the end of 1918, his writings did not show any Marxist influence, nor was there any mention of Marx. In this pre-Marxist phase, Li's conception of history was characterised by his belief that history

contained within itself a cyclical movement that was not unlike the dynastic changes in Chinese society. Thus he believed that the future of the world belonged to the emerging countries such as Russia and China, while the more developed nations were on a downward slide in their fortunes. Such a Social Darwinist view of history was quite evident in his essay "Spring", which was published in the September 1916 issue of HCN.

> The famous nations of Europe — such as Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and even England — all have long histories that are by now covered in dust. This past is a heavy burden on the lives of these countries and their peoples. The tide of the times are now against them.(112)

Thus although at this time Li also showed his support for the Western concept of democracy, he did not demonstrate the same degree of enthusiasm as Ch'en Tu-hsiu and others for the Allies' cause in the First World War. In 1917 he took much greater interest in the occurrence of the February Revolution in Russia. His attraction to the events in Russia was due less to the ideological basis of the February Revolution, than to his belief that the overthrow of Czarism in Russia was but the beginning of a great new historical wave that would bring Russia, China and other emerging countries to the fore. In March of that year, in an essay on "The influence of the great Russian Revolution", he remarked that the February Revolution was the first of the twentieth century's revolutions against bureaucratic government, and that "the success of this revolution in Russia will certainly influence the next revolution in China".(113) Moreover, in line with his pessimistic view of the advanced West, Li further remarked that a victory for the Allies in the First World War would not be a victory for democracy, but a victory for bureaucratic

government.(114)

Thus, when the October Revolution occurred in Russia a few months later, the course of events there was closely followed by Li. However, his reaction to October was similar to his earlier response to February: his attention was not so much drawn by the ideological basis of the Russian revolutionaries, as by the very fact of their achievement which he interpreted as another progressive step towards a new era in human history.

Apart from his conception of a cyclical movement in history, Li's thinking in his pre-Marxist period was also characterised by a belief in the power of human consciousness to mould historical circumstances and attain progress. In an essay entitled "The present" and published in HCN in April 1918, Li wrote:

> We who live on this earth must not be tired of "the present", or just think about "the past", or dream about "the future". If we do this, we will be wasting the energy of "the present". At the same time, we must not feel complacent about "the present", and must use the energy we have now to develop "the future". ..... The good or bad deeds we do now will never be destroyed. Thus our responsibility in life is to be positive, and create happiness for those who come after us, so that the infinite "I" (i.e. succeeding generations) can enjoy such happiness, enlarge upon it, and pass it on to yet another generation. In this way, we can then achieve the meaning of "The Universe is I, and I the Universe".(115)

This faith in the power of man's conscious action to overcome objective conditions and create history was also evident in another essay, "The new! the old!", published in the following year in HCN.

> I hope our youth will lift up their spirits, and open a new path in politics, society, literature, thought and other fields, and to create a new kind of life. ..... This is the duty of our youth. Let us see how great

> is the power of creation of our new youth.
> Forward! Forward! Forward! New youth!(116)

To Li, a small group of men in Russia had indeed come forward and succeeded in overthrowing the old and corrupt Czarist society. This historical spectacle of a rapid transformation held out great inspiration and fascination for him. In July 1918 Li published his essay on "A comparative view of the French and Russian revolutions", in which the deep emotional commitment he had formed towards the Russian Revolution was quite evident. He declared that the Russian Revolution, compared with the French Revolution, was of an infinitely higher level of human development, because the latter had been narrow and nationalistic in its outlook, while the former was highly internationalist in flavour and would be of great universal significance in heralding a new age of historical development for the world.(117)

In the following months, Li's identification with the Russian Revolution became progressively stronger, and he gradually came to an initial acceptance of the ideological basis of the Bolsheviks' victory. In the November 1918 issue of HCN, the two famous articles by Li, "Victory of the common people" and "Victory of Bolshevism", both showed definite Marxist influences.

"Victory of the common people" was a speech delivered by Li on the Allies' victory in the First World War. He asserted that the conclusion of the war represented a victory for the common people, because the social consequence of the war was a victory for "labourism" (lao-kung chu-i 勞工主義) over capitalism.(118) Li then went on to give an explanation of the origin and outcome of the war.

> The real cause of this war lies in the development of capitalism, the productive power of which cannot be contained within national boundaries. Thus the capitalist governments had hoped to

> use the war to smash down national boundaries. The idea was to create a world-wide empire with one country as the economic centre, in order to seek benefits for the capitalists of that country. The labour communities (lao-kung she-hui 勞工社會) in Russia, Germany and other countries were the first to see through these avaricious motives. In the middle of the war, they began the social revolution to stop this war of the capitalist governments. The labour communities in the allied countries also wanted peace, and gradually tended towards the same action as their counterparts in the enemy countries. This was how the greatest war in the world was concluded. This was how this new era of the transformation of the world was begun. This was how capitalism was defeated. This was how labourism won.(119)

In "Victory of Bolshevism", Li first gave another Marxist interpretation of the war, and then went on to describe the programme of action of the Bolsheviks. He stressed the fact that there was public ownership of the means of production, and that all who worked organised themselves into soviets. He believed that a system of such soviets would eventually be organised in other countries, guided by the ideology of Bolshevism, "the new doctrine of twentieth-century revolution".(120)

It is interesting to note that while Li was undoubtedly highly enthusiastic about the consequential aspect of Bolshevism, that is, that this ideology would create a new order, he hardly discussed in either of these two essays the Marxist economic interpretation of society and history. This reflected his initial response to the Russian Revolution, which was based more on his perception that the Bolsheviks had carried out an act of revolution, than any real theoretical interest in their ideology. We have earlier mentioned his faith in the power of human consciousness to create history, and it did seem that at this time he still had not reconciled fully this belief with the Marxist tenet that economic determinism was the major factor in history. Such a reconciliation would come later.

But in November 1918, what was of great significance was

Li's fervent belief that henceforth all revolutions would be of the Bolshevik type. Towards the end of his "Victory of Bolshevism" article, he first quoted and supported Trotsky's assertion that the Russian Revolution would be "the fuse to world revolution", and he concluded his article with the following famous passage on his prediction for the future course of history.

> Henceforth, everywhere we will see the victorious banners of Bolshevism, and everywhere we will hear the songs of victory of Bolshevism! The bell of humanitarianism has been rung! The dawn of freedom is here! See the world of tomorrow, it will be the world of the red banners! ..... The Russian Revolution is the first autumn leaf that tells the world of the coming of autumn. The word "Bolshevism" has been created by the Russians, but it also represents the spirit of common awakening in the heart of every person in the twentieth century.(121)

At about the time of these two articles in November 1918, Li organised the Marxist Research Society (Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i yen-chiu hui 馬克斯主義研究會)[122] This comprised mainly his students at Peking University, with Li largely as the leader in this first serious study of Marxist ideas by Chinese intellectuals. According to the official biographer of Mao Tse-tung's early life, Mao participated in the meetings of the Society during his stay in Peking between September 1919 and early 1919.(123) At the time, Mao was working at the university's library as an assistant under Li who was the Chief Librarian. In his own words, "under Li Ta-chao, I rapidly developed towards Marxism".(124)

In February 1919, Li published in HCN an essay on the question of women in society. His viewpoint on this question was quite different from that of his HCN colleagues who pointed to the women's movements in the West as a model for China. Of the demands of the women's movements in England, Li had this to say.

> What these middle-class (chung-ch'an chieh-chih 中產階級) women want are equal rights and powers with men in the society of well-off

> gentlemen. As for the women of the proletariat, all they possess are their persons, all they hope for is an improvement in their livelihood. Thus the former want to rule the others, while the latter only want to liberate their lives from poverty. The situation of the two classes are basically different, and so the wishes of the two classes differ too.(125)

Li's thinking at this time, though far from being sophisticatedly Marxist, was basically different from that of the others on HCN. Right up to the May Fourth Incident, Li's interest in Marxism must be considered as only a deviant tendency in the mainstream of HCN's ideology, but of course it is with historical hindsight that Li's thinking at this time is of such great significance. The impression one gets from reading issues of HCN published in the period between September 1915 and April 1919 is still of a magazine advocating liberal-bourgeois ideas. The May 1919 issue of HCN, which we will look at in the next chapter, was the special number on Marxism edited by Li, and contained Li's important essay "My Marxist view". The month it was published was also the month of the May Fourth Incident. Thereafter, the course of events developed quickly. HCN became more and more committed to political activism, and the influence of socialist ideas was more and more discernable.

7. The Influence of HCN in This Period.

In this section, we will first look at HCN's journalistic impact on the world of periodical publications, and then on the readers' response and the conservative opposition's reaction to the magazine.

Apart from the fact that it was among the first vernacular magazines in China, HCN also represented a new style of journalism. In the execution of its three main aims in this period — the attack on Chinese tradition, the promotion of new ideas and

the literary revolution -- the tone of the magazine was sharp and uncompromising. A reason for the effectiveness and popularity of HCN was that its various editors and main contributors all had their individual literary styles and respective fields of specialisation. Ch'en Tu-hsiu went in for virtually all subjects in his impassioned and powerful essays. Hu Shih's essays were lucid and concise, and would appeal specially to the intellectual young, since Hu himself was at the time a newly-returned student from abroad. Lu Hsün was of course noted for his short and sharp stories and comments on the Chinese people and society. As for Liu Fu, Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung, Kao I-han, Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei and Chou Tso-jen, they brought to the magazine their respective academic training, though their articles were not without humour or passionate commitment. In answer to a reader who wrote in to ask why HCN often "rebuked" those people with "erroneous thought", Ch'en Tu-hsiu had this to say.

> When it comes to a discussion of important things, the majority of us on the magazine are short-tempered, frank and cannot help but raise our voice a bit. We would rather have other people call us ruffians and uncouth, than put on airs of those gentlemen who beat about the bush and end up confusing everybody.(126)

This directness in HCN's approach was also apparent in the magazine's "Correspondence" column. This column ran from the first number of the magazine, and was an important and popular part of the magazine. In later issues, this feature of the magazine covered twenty or more pages of each issue. An indication of the number of readers' letters HCN received was the apology given to one reader for answering his letter six months after it had been received.(127) The "Correspondence" column served several purposes: a venue for readers' opinions, a problem-and-advice service, and a place where discussion was pursued and developed. In another respect,

it was mainly through the comments and debates in this column that the initial momentum of the literary revolution developed. Hu Shih's and Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung's involvement with HCN both began with their writing to the magazine. As an advice column, it had answered readers' queries as to where they could obtain Western books, study new subjects, learn foreign languages, and even questions concerning hygiene. It also provided a great deal of information on studying abroad.(128)

A "Readers' Forum" (Tu-che lun-t'an 讀者論壇) was started in September 1916, and this offered an opportunity for the magazine's young readers to vent their views on matters that were closest to them. In the two years and eight months of its existence, there were discussions of such problems as the social responsibility of youth, the family system, love and marriage, and education. Several of the students who initially contributed to this column later became regular contributors to the magazine. The two most prominent of these were Fu Ssu-nien and Lo Chia-lun, the founders of the New Tide magazine in January 1919.(129)

Mention has already been made of the "Random Thoughts" column and the fact that it was a new innovation in Chinese periodical publications. In the same satirical vein as this column was the "What Nonsense" (Shen-mo hua 什麼話) page which consisted of reprints of outrageous statements of the conservative opposition and records of other ridiculous happenings. Hu Shih explained why they started such a column.

> We read the newspapers every day, and we find all sorts of materials that perhaps make us cringe in disbelief, make us sigh, chuckle in contempt, or just send us into hysterics. These materials are worth reproducing, and so we are starting this column.(130)

On the other hand, HCN was a source of help and inspiration to the many new periodicals that sprang up in the months just before and after the May Fourth Incident. (A selection of the more important periodicals of the May Fourth period will be surveyed in Appendix B.) In 1917 HCN briefly ran a column introducing new books, among which were books on sociology, European governments and European literary criticism.(131). The magazine also carried information and announcements from some of the progressive organisations of the New Culture Movement. It had helped by giving publicity in its pages to such organisations as the Frugal Study in France Association (Liu-Fa chien-hsüeh hui 留法儉學會) and the Peita's Students' Frugal Study Association (Pei-ching ta-hsüeh t'ung-hsüeh chien-hsüeh hui 北京大學同學儉學會), both of which encouraged and helped students with limited financial means to further their studies.(132)

In many ways then, HCN was a new-style magazine among the contemporary Chinese periodicals. We saw in Section 2 of the last chapter that at the time of the founding of HCN, the world of Chinese periodical publications was in the doldrums. The arrival of HCN did not of course change this situation overnight. However, from the point of view of the New Culture Movement, HCN offered an early platform from which the movement gathered its initial momentum. HCN maintained its position as the most influential magazine of the movement throughout the May Fourth period. Many of the magazines that appeared later were modelled after it, and it was very likely that their editors, like many of the progressive youth of the time, were readers of HCN. In the April 1919 issue of the New Tide magazine, perhaps the most important of the student-run magazines then, Lo Chia-lun, one of its founder-editors, wrote of the magazines in China at the time. Of HCN, he was full

of admiration.

> HCN is the newest motive force in the reformation of China. Its discussions are thorough, and the boldness of its standpoint is outstanding. In these points, HCN is unique.(133)

At this time, HCN was very much regarded as the mentor of the awakening students of the time. HCN appeared at a crucial period in the republican period, a time when the ills of the country were becoming depressingly apparent. The magazine's message of the need for a transformation of Chinese society found a ready audience amongst patriotic youth. This message was particularly effective when made by such noted new intellectuals as those who worked on the magazine. Indeed, many of the magazine's readers wrote to the "Correspondence" column, describing how HCN had given them a new social consciousness, and praising the magazine in the most enthusiastic terms. The following is a selection of excerpts from such letters.

> I just came to Shanghai from the country. So far, I have read three issues of your magazine, and admire it a great deal. I especially like the correspondence column. There are many things I come across which I do not understand, nor for which my teachers and friends can give me a satisfactory answer. Now your correspondence column has filled this gap.(134)

> Your magazine is like a bright star to us young people. Since I became a reader, every time I meet a good young man, I always ask him the question whether he has read Youth Magazine. If he says he has not, I always try to introduce it to him. Today, issue No.5 came out. You must know that before that I have asked at the bookshop several times, and I could not wait any longer. I started to read the first few pages, and felt that every sentence moved me. How I wish I were tens of thousands of people all at once, and I could introduce your magazine to everybody.(135)

> This spring I read your magazine for the first time. As if woken up by a blow on the head, I suddenly realised the value of youth. We should emulate the West, and abolish the old and welcome the new. I continue to buy and read your magazine. I am like somebody who is sick, and who

> must breathe in fresh air and exhale the foul. Although at present I am still not what you might describe as a new youth, I am sure that I can sweep away from my mind all the old thoughts of the past. The credit for all this goes to all the save-the-youth work you have been doing.(136)

> The influence of HCN here in Chengtu, Szechuan has improved since last year. Fewer of our friends are now reproaching us for reading this magazine, but some of them still refuse to read it themselves. ..... It is no longer like a few years ago when we had to learn the classics from a few "saintly" scholars, and were not allowed to have our own thoughts. Although these things are signs of the times, they are also the achievements of HCN who is at present changing China.(137)

The popularity of HCN among the youth improved even more after the May Fourth Incident. Pa Chin 巴金 , in his novel, The Family , describes how, with the increasing public concern and discussion of the country's affairs, the three brothers in the novel were searching out all the progressive magazines to read, and in particular HCN, ' back-copies of which they demanded from the bookshops.(138)

Another kind of source material that can be used to gauge the contemporary influence of HCN are the various memoirs and reminiscences of noted men in modern Chinese history. The most famous of these is of course Mao Tse-tung. In his autobiography as related to Edgar Snow, Mao talked about his ideas during the early May Fourth period.

> Most of these societies (student societies supporting the New Culture Movement) were organised under the influences of Hsin ch'ing-nien, the famous magazine of the literary renaissance, edited by Ch'en Tu-hsiu. I began to read this magazine while I was a student in the normal school and admired the articles of Hu Shih and Ch'en Tu-hsiu very much. They became for a while my models, replacing Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Kang Yu-wei, whom I had already discarded.
>
> At this time my mind was a curious mixture of ideas of liberalism, democratic socialism. 'I had somewhat vague passions about "nineteenth-

> century democracy", utopianism, and old-fashioned liberalism, and I was definitely antimilitarist and anti-imperialist. (139, my parenthesis)

In the April 1917 issue of HCN, there was in fact an essay from Mao. Under the pen-name of Twenty-eight-strokes Student (Erh-shih-pa-hua Sheng 二十八劃生, referring to the number of strokes in his name), he spoke of the benefits of physical fitness, and enjoined his fellow countrymen to take up physical fitness exercises.(140) Mao's other activities at this time included his editorship of the Hsiang River Review (Hsiang-chiang p'ing-lun 湘江評論) which is included in the May Fourth period-

icals surveyed in Appendix B
p'ing-lun 湘江評論) which is included in the May Fourth period

Edgar Snow's account in Red Star Over China also describes the influence of HCN on Chou En-lai and Peng Teh-huai, although it seemed that they came to know HCN only after it had become a committed Marxist magazine.(141) Among others who have described the influence of HCN on themselves in this period was Mao Tun 茅盾 (the pen-name of Shen Yen-ping 沈雁冰), a famous modern Chinese novelist who in fact was an active member of HCN in the early 1920s. (See Chapter 4 and Appendix A) Writing in 1946, he recalled the May Fourth years.

> At the time, I first read HCN, and it had a great stimulating power on me. Before, I had felt as if I were in darkness, then the windows were opened up for me.(142)

Ts'ao Chü-jen 曹聚仁, another man of letters of modern China, also described his first contact with HCN. He related how in the spring of 1917 he was travelling by boat in the company of an old school-friend who showed him some copies of the magazine.

> I turned over several pages, and nearly leapt right out of the boat. This was because the viewpoint of the magazine went directly against the classics and tradition. I really did not believe that this respectable student of science (his

> friend) would really read this kind of magazine. My friend then had a long and serious talk with me, and told me that even our teacher was a reader. It was really strange. From that time on, I was a reader of HCN, and later on became one of its disciples.(143)

But the success that HCN enjoyed in these years also did not fail to attract the attention of the conservative forces. In January 1919, in a short article in which he discussed and defended the magazine's editorial policy, Ch'en Tu-hsiu described the opposition's objections to HCN.

> They accuse us of the crimes of trying to destroy Confucianism, the traditional laws, the national quintessence, the old ethics, the old morality (loyalty, filial piety, fidelity), the old arts (Chinese theatre), the old religions (ghosts, gods), the old literature, and the old politics (oligarchy). (144, parentheses in the original).

It was not surprising that the more popular HCN became with the young, the more it would attract the attention and opposition of the conservative section of Chinese society. In Peking University, for example, the centre of the new intellectuals' activities, there arose an opposition group in the Faculty of Letters. This group of conservative scholars and students, known as the Kiangsu-Chekiang Faction (Chiang-Che p'ai 江浙派), formed the main opposition to the New Culture Movement.(145) They published their own magazine National Heritage (Kuo-ku 國故), which advocated the retention of the traditonal literature and the preservation of the "national quintessence" in general.(146) However, this magazine, founded in March 1919, never achieved a wide readership, and lasted only four issues. Part of the reason was undoubtedly its unreadability, with its use of the old classical style and archaic words. On the other hand, the new intellectuals were themselves extremely well-versed in the classics, and were thus able to go on the offensive and wage the intellectual battle on the home-ground of the conservative

scholars. Their analyses of the classics, in vivid and highly readable vernacular language, had much more logical thinking and credibility than the writings of the conservatives.

In February 1919, the conservative forces for once went on the offensive. Lin Shu, whose oppostion to the literary reforms has already been mentioned (in Section 5), published in a Shanghai newspaper an allegoric short story condemning and ridiculing the New Culture Movement and its leaders.(147) In the following month, he also published an open letter to Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, in which he criticised Ts'ai for promoting anti-Confucianism and the new literature both inside and outside of Peking University.(148) In a long reply, Ts'ai answered most eloquently Lin's criticisms, and put forward various arguments for the New Culture Movement.(149) It seemed that the objections raised by the conservative scholars had little effect in halting the momemtum of the New Culture Movement. If anything, their action indirectly helped the movement by generating public interest in the issues raised by the new intellectuals.

But the success of HCN and other progressive magazines in winning the allegiance of the young did not escape the attention of the Peking government. In March 1919, only three months after the New Tide magazine had been established, the Ministry of Education wrote to Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei , asking him to suspend the magazine which was being produced by a group of students at Peking University. This, however, Ts'ai refused to do on the grounds of freedom of speech within the university.(150) This was followed by an attempt by the Anfu Club to induce Parliament to censure Ts'ai and the Minister of Education, Fu Tseng-hsiang 傅增湘 . This motion did not go through Parliament, due mainly to the fear of strong opposition from the student-body and public opinion at large.(151) There

followed rumours of imminent government intervention in the affairs of the university, and such rumours were partly responsible for Ch'en Tu-hsiu's resignation from the post of the Dean of the Faculty of Letters.(152) Again in April 1919, the governor of Kiangsu province put out an order to local authorities and schools not to buy or read any publications that criticised the national quintessence and promoted the new literature.(153) All these official attempts to restrict the New Culture Movement are indications of its contemporary impact.

8. Conclusion.

In 1962, the Daian Company of Japan published a photo-fascimile editon of HCN. In a short foreword to this edition, Hu Shih described HCN as:

> .... a journal of a transitional period in the history of Chinese literature and Chinese thought. A large part of the literary movement and thought reformation of the last twenty years have come from this journal.(154)

In the pre-1919 period of the May Fourth Movement, the anti-Confucianism and anti-feudalism of the HCN intellectuals were indeed representative of the sentiments of the community of new intellectuals of the time. To them, the struggle lay in the cultural and intellectual field, and not in politics. Benjamin Schwartz has suggested that this preoccupation with a cultural solution reflected the new intellectuals' alienation from the politics of the republic and their rejection of any formal political commitments as an appropriate course of action.(155) Ch'en Tu-hsiu, at this time in particular, was extremely disillusioned with the state of republican politics in China, and stressed the neccesity for a cultural transformation of the masses as a prerequisite to any political changes. This conscious rejection of political activism, and the reasons

for it, were most clearly stated by Ch'en in January 1916.

> With the departure of 1915, party politics should become a thing of the past. They are not suited to China at present. ..... The development of party politics in our country is still very short and shallow. The scope of party politics is too narrow, and it is but the property of a privileged sector of the people. The political parties see themselves as enterprises to divide power and privileges among themselves. ..... If something is proposed by one faction or party, and has not come from a movement of the whole people, then its success is unlikely. Even if it should succeed, it would not bring any fundamental improvement to the people.(156)

Nor did the new intellectuals lay the blame for the failure of republican politics solely at the door of the political parties, but they believed that the other side of the political coin was the democratic backwardness of the Chinese people. Writing in 1918 of the 1911 Revolution, Kao I-han noted that "although we no longer have an emperor on the throne, there is still one in the minds of the people!"(157) The same sentiment was expressed by T'ao Meng-ho in the same year.

> The republic of the last seven years is one without citizens. The people have not made a noise or made a move, or said to the rulers, "We are here, watching you! This is the reason why the rulers have been able to make so much evil."(158)

The course of action the new intellectuals decided on was to destroy the old values and substitute Western ones for them. The new values discussed in the pages of HCN — such as liberalism, individualism, democracy, utilitarianism and science — were all ideas from the West, and which the new intellectuals believed to have accounted for the success and superiority of Western society in the modern world. The commitment to Marxism and the critique of Western bourgeois societies came later on. For the time being, bourgeois democracy was the model for China. In 1918, Kao I-han noted that:

> We can directly arrive at the benefits other societies have come to via trial and error. They have gone through numerous experimentations, and their successes have come from failures. By comparison with them, we are still at an early stage of development, and so we can take a shortcut to success.(159)

To the new intellectuals, this shortcut consisted of a cultural-intellectual transformation of Chinese society, and not direct political action. Indeed, as we saw in Section 2, the HCN intellectuals had specifically stated that it would not be the aim of the magazine to make comments on the contemporary political situation. They could not in fact keep to this declared intention. Initially, such political comments were indirect, but with the unfolding of the course of events in contemporary politics, the HCN intellectuals, especially Ch'en Tu-hsiu, realised how difficult it was to avoid such comments. An analysis of this gradual change in attitude is important for two reasons. The first is that it throws further light on the new intellectuals' own conception of their work in relation to Chinese society, and the second is that such a description helps to explain the magazine's later tendency towards political activism and eventual commitment to Marxism.

In the first two years of the magazine, the part of the magazine where one most often comes across direct political comments is the "Record of Home Events" (Kuo-nei ta-shih chi 國內大事記) column which was supposedly to provide a simple chronology of the main events in China. But in HCN's reportage of such events as the debate on the constitution, the goings-on in the Peking government and Parliament, the disputes between political parties and the monarchical movements, one often finds pointed and direct criticisms of the political situation. At the same time, a closer reading of HCN in this period also

reveals that the discussion of ideas was often linked to the course of political events in China. The most striking example of this correlation was that after K'ang Yu-wei had petitioned the government in the autumn of 1916 to include Confucianism as a state religion in the country's constitution, there followed a whole series of articles in HCN that ranged in their scope from direct attacks on K'ang's proposals, to a wholesale attack on Confucian ethics.(160) In these articles, the HCN writers argued that Confucianism and democracy were two mutually exclusive quantities, and that more specifically the establishment of Confucianism as a state religion would go against the concepts of the freedom of speech and freedom. In such a way, a link was forged, both directly and indirectly, between the anti-feudal thought movement and the political movement for democracy.

From 1917 on, as the political situation became more and more chaotic, Ch'en Tu-hsiu found it increasingly difficult to refrain from making direct comments on the situation. In July 1917, in a reply to a letter from a reader who suggested that HCN should adhere more to its original policy of not commenting on contemporary politics, he explained why such comments could not be avoided. His explanation is quoted in some length here, as this passage demonstrates how he had moved from his initial "apolitical" position, and foreshadowed the course of Ch'en's own political career and the later editorial direction of HCN.

> I do not blindly believe that politics can solve everything. In fact, I think politics can be held accountable for a great part of the evil in society. But the life of mankind must pass through this stage, and we are in this stage now, and so politics are inevitably an important part of human life. A neglect of politics would be the greatest barrier to our evolution. While it is true that the evolution of a society has its roots in the work of education and not politics, the work

> of education can only have room to develop if politics are above a certain level. ..... It is true that the aim of our magazine is not to criticise the present political situation; the cultivation of youth does not include the discussion of politics. But if politics concern the very survival of our country, how can we remain silent. ..... If we do not put into practice the things we have learnt, then we would be like cold-blooded animals that neglect the practical side of life. We would then be like the old-style students of China, and not the new youth of the twentieth century.(161)

Ch'en's viewpoint in this passage was a clear departure from the original conception of HCN. He was finding more and more restrictive the magazine's policy of an avoidance of political comment. His articles in 1918 were touching more and more on immediate political problems. Although he still had no intention of participating in the oligarchical politics of the political parties, he increasingly felt that to avoid commenting on them was an ostrich-like policy. In December, Ch'en and Li Ta-chao founded the Weekly Critic (Mei-chou p'ing-lun 每周評論), a political review where they could vent freely their views on the political situation. (For details of the Weekly Critic, see Appendix B.) By this time, as was described in Section 6, definite Marxist influences were already showing in Li's writings, as were in his two articles, "Victory of the common people" and "Victory of Bolshevism". The establishment of another magazine by Li and Ch'en was another knock at the united ranks of HCN intellectuals. This episode was later recalled by Hu Shih.

> When we started to work together on HCN in 1917, we had a common idea that we would not talk about politics for twenty years. We agreed to avoid politics for twenty years, and to concentrate on educational, intellectual and cultural affairs, so that we could build up a political foundation by way of nonpolitical factors. But this agreement was difficult to keep, because even if we had promised to avoid political discussions, the political situation forced us to be involved in it. When Mr. Ch'en and Mr. Li founded the Weekly Critic

> in 1918, I did not criticise it. I can remember that when they asked me to contribute to it, I only sent them translations of two short stories.(162)

Apart from this divergence in viewpoint, it seemed that there was a certain degree of disaffinity in personality between Ch'en and Hu. Lu Hsün has given a description of the two at HCN's editorial meetings.

> After an issue of HCN has come out, there would be an editorial meeting to discuss the articles for the next issue. At that time, the two persons who most caught my attention were Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Hu Shih. Let us compare them in an analogy of a warehouse. Outside of Mr.Ch'en's warehouse was a large flag with these large words written on it: "This warehouse is stored with weapons. Visitors should take care." But the door to this warehouse was wide open, and one could see easily all the weapons inside. There was thus little cause for caution. As for Mr. Hu's warehouse, its door was tightly closed, and on it was a little slip of paper which read, "There are no weapons inside. There is no need to be cautious." This of course could be true, but some people could not help but ponder in doubt.(163)

Such personal factors and the more important difference in opinion over the relevance of politics made for dislocating forces in the collaborative effort on HCN. This divergence was greatly accelerated by the emotive events in 1919. On top of this came the intrusion of Marxist influences, Li Ta-chao's and then Ch'en Tu-hsiu's commitment to Marxism. All these developments, which will be examined in the following chapter, were to bring about the split in 1921.

Chinese Communist historians today justifiably accord HCN with considerable importance in the New Culture period of the May Fourth Movement. Li Lung-mu divides the development of the magazine into three periods: the first from its founding in 1915 to the end of 1918, the second from 1919 to the founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921, and the third from 1921 to when HCN ceased publication in 1926.(164) Of the

first period, Li Lung-mu describes HCN's contribution to the Chinese revolutionary movement as follows.

> It was the centre of the early anti-feudal New Culture Movement, and the standard-bearer of the struggle of the progressive democrats. In its all-out struggle against feudal thought, HCN had, objectively speaking, the effect of sweeping part of the way clear for the propagation of Marxist thought in China.(165)

At the same time, Li was also ready to point out, from a Marxist viewpoint, the shortcomings of the magazine in this period. These were its advocacy of bourgeois political values and somewhat indiscriminate Westernisation, as well as its non-involvement in politcal affairs. Li remarked that "the historical proof" of the existence of these shortcomings was that the right wing of the HCN intellectuals, especially Hu Shih, later became the supporters of imperialism.(166)

The striking characteristic of the New Culture period of the May Fourth Movement was indeed the great variety of new and Western ideas in the air at the time. HCN was in the forefront in the introduction and discussion of these ideas. In the course of the years, these ideas found their respective supporters. But before this came about, and in the intellectual excitement of this period, HCN was a leader in the search for the ideas that would save China. It achieved a considerable influence on the youth of the time, and it was the impact achieved in these years that made HCN's later tendency towards socialism and then Marxism so credible and influential on its readers, and helped towards the spread of Marxism in China. Thus, in a way, one can say that the very fact that HCN did not come to Marxism from the very beginning, and that it itself had experimented with various ideas, only made its later commitment to Marxism all the more convincing to a crucial generation of Chinese youth.

CHAPTER 3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPLIT BETWEEN THE LIBERALS AND THE MARXISTS ON HCN, MAY 1919 - FEBRUARY 1921.

1. Background Events.

An underlying reason for the historic events of May 1919 was the failure of the 1911 Revolution to produce a strong and united central government. This laid China further open to various forms of imperialist intrusions. Since the death of Yüan Shih-K'ai in 1916, Japan in particular, had carefully groomed Tuan Ch'i-jui and the Peiyang clique to further her interests in China. However, as was noted in the last chapter, the new intellectuals believed that an Allies' victory in the First World War would bring about a new order based on rationality, justice and respect for the weaker nations. This hope was further bolstered by President Wilson's enunciation of the Fourteen Points in January 1918, which included a renunciation of all secret diplomacy and the proposal for an impartial adjustment of colonial claims.(1)

But at the Versailles Conference, Japan succeeded, with the support of Britain and France, and America's tacit agreement, in taking over all of Germany's former privileges in China's Shantung Peninsula. On the other hand, the Chinese government's proposals to the Conference to abolish the foreign rights and privileges in China, and to abrogate the Twenty-one Demands, were not even discussed. This failure in China's diplomacy destroyed the new intellectuals' high hopes of the Peace Conference, and a a wave of fervent patriotism and indignation swept the country.

On May 4th, several thousand students demonstrated in Peking, and demanded the punishment of Ts'ao Ju-lin, Lu Tsung-yü and Chang Tsung-hsiang 曹汝霖、陸宗輿、章宗祥 , the three

Chinese representatives at Versailles. The students' cries of "Externally Resist the Great Powers, Internally Remove the Traitors" (Wai-k'ang chiang-ch'üan, nei ch'u kuo-tsʻe 外抗強權，內除國賊) became the patriotic rallying call of the subsequent protest movement. Over-reaction on the part of the authorities was answered by students leaving their classrooms to give speeches and distribute leaflets on the streets. After the so-called June Third Incident, in which the Peking government arrested hundreds of student demonstrators, the centre of protest moved from Peking to Shanghai. From June 5th to June 10th, textile workers, metal workers, transport workers and municipal workers in Shanghai successively went on strike in protest against the proposed Shantung settlement. These were followed by protest actions on the part of industrialists and merchants, not only in Shanghai but also in the other main cities.

Such spontaneous but quickly-coordinated actions by the students, workers and elements of the bourgeoisie led to the dismissal of the three Chinese negotiators at Versailles, the release of the students arrested, and China's refusal to sign the Versailles Peace Treaty. But perhaps even more important than these short-term successes was the increasingly widespread belief, in those emotion-charged months, of the belief in the efficacy of direct political action. Before the May Fourth Incident, there were only several student organisations and societies organised along the lines of the Western voluntary associations.(2) In the course of the protest movement, however, the practice of forming into associations and organisations was increasingly popular not only among students, but also among merchants and workers. Many student unions, initially organised to

mobilise support for the May Fourth protest, became permanent associations on a city-based or province-based scale. The students also organised themselves into various intellectual organisations for the study of various new ideas. Typical of such student organisations was the Young China Association (Shao-nien Chung-kuo hsüeh-hui 少年中國學會) which was formally established in Peking in July 1919. Its membership consisted mainly of new intellectuals and student activists, many of whom were later to play prominent parts in various spheres of Chinese life. At the suggestion of Li Ta-chao and others, the aim of the Association was "to dedicate itself to serving society, under the guidance of the scientific spirit and in order to create a young China".(3)

Modern trade unions also started to develop in the months after the May Fourth Incident. The workers' protest following the June 3rd Incident had demonstrated their strength, and the Industrial Association of China (Chung-hua kung-yeh hsieh-hui 中華工業協會) and the Federation of Chinese Labour Unions (Chung-hua kung-hui tsung-hui 中華工會總會) were soon organised in Shanghai.(4) Labour organisations were particularly strong and numerous in the Kwangtung region, partly because of the encouragement of Sun Yat-sen and partly because of the influence of the labour movement in Hong Kong.

On the political front, various members of the Progressive Party and Kuomintang came out in support of the patriotic and anti-government protest. Newspapers of the Progressive Party had lent their support to the New Culture Movement, and in 1920-21, it was members of the party who sponsored Bertrand Russell's visit to China. But the influence of the Progressive Party was limited in this period, due mainly to the divergence in standpoints between its progressive

and conservative wings, with the latter still maintaining some sort of relations with the warlords. It was members of the Kuomintang, of all the political parties, which were most forthcoming with their support for the movement. In January 1920 Sun Yat-sen wrote enthusiastically of the movement and called upon his fellow Kuomintang members to support it.

> After the May Fourth Movement has been launched by the students of the National University of Peking, all patriotic youths realised that intellectual reform is the prerequisite for future reform activities. ..... Society has been greatly influenced by the movement, and even the thoroughly corrupt and reactionary puppet government in Peking is afraid of it. ..... If the movement continues to grow and expand, it will certainly produce great and ever-lasting results.(5)

In August 1920 Tuan Ch'i-jui and the Anfu Club were turned out of Peking by the forces of Ts'ao K'un 曹錕 and Wu P'ei-fu 吳佩孚, two warlords who defeated Tuan's army in July with the help of Chang Tso-lin 張作霖, the warlord based in Manchuria. To the new intellectuals, this development only confirmed their view that the party politics in the republic were a farce, and nothing but the struggle and division of power between different cliques. On the other hand, the May Fourth protest movement, by its sheer pace, intensity and success in influencing government decisions, demonstrated to the new intellectuals that political activities, in the form of direct action by the masses, were not only desirable but also vitally necessary. As we shall see in this chapter, the events in 1919 also brought about a rapid disenchantment with the idea of looking at the West as a model for China. These developments, coupled with an active interest in socialist ideas taken by the radicals on HCN, culminated in the collapse of the united ranks of the HCN intellectuals in early 1921.

2. The Participation of the HCN Intellectuals in the May Fourth Protest Movement.

It is clear that the students' protest, from its very outset, received the enthusiastic support of the HCN group. From its first issue in September 1915, the magazine had been calling on the country's youth "to be independent and not servile, progressive and not conservative, aggressive and not retiring ....."(6) Thus the great explosion of protest activities following the Incident must have first pleasantly surprised the new intellectuals, and then were actively supported by them. Members of the HCN group were at the time very much the intellectual heroes of the progressive youth, and following the Incident, many of them were invited to join the various societies that sprang up.

Of the HCN intellectuals, perhaps Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, as the Chancellor of Peking University, was most directly involved with the students' protest. On the evening of the day of the Incident, for example, after the students had complained to him that they had been roughly handled by the police and that some of the students had been arrested, Ts'ai took upon himself the responsibility for the release of the students and went to the police station to try to have the students set free.(7) Although his effort on this occasion was unsuccessful, he remained a staunch supporter of the students' activities against the government. Several days later, on the 8th, the Peking government issued a mandate restricting the students' activities and placing part of the blame for the disturbances on the chancellors of several Peking colleges.(8) Following the issue of this mandate, Ts'ai tendered his resignation as Chancellor of Peking University (9), and the other chancellors concerned quickly

followed suit.(10)

Li Ta-chao also worked actively with the students. In the weeks following the Incident, his office in Peking University became one of the regular meeting-places of the students. He also asked members of the Marxist Research Society to take part in the movement. Among these was Teng Chung-hsia 鄧中夏, later a prominent communist, who went to Shanghai and helped in the organisation of the workers' strike there early in June.(11)

On June 11th, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was arrested while distributing protest leaflets in the streets of Peking. According to Li Ta-chao, the reason for Ch'en's arrest was because he had approved the publication of Li's article, "Victory of Bolshevism" in HCN in November 1918.(12) Ch'en was imprisoned for eighty-three days, and released in September. It could well have been Ch'en's imprisonment, and the active involvement of the other HCN intellectuals in the protest movement, that caused the suspension in publication of HCN for six months between June and October inclusive in 1919.

In the first issue of HCN published after the Incident, there were vernacular poems by Liu Fu, Hu Shih and Li Ta-chao in celebration of Ch'en's release from prison. Li wrote:

> You are now out of prison.
> We are all rejoicing!
> Though we have been only parted days,
> There have been many changes here:
> "The Eye" which we previously had, was suddenly lost,
> Our magazine was then lacking in light, and its value reduced;
> And now the light of "The Eye" has been restored,
> But then we cannot find the magazine which you and we have created!
> However, you need not lament and you need not sigh,
> We now have many, many reincarnated forms who have stood up in the meantime:
> They are like the seedlings of flowers and grass
> Which have been deposited everywhere by the wind.(13)

"The Eye" in Li's poem refers to Ch'en Tu-hsiu who used

the words chih yen (隻眼, the eye) as one of his several pen-names. The passage in the middle obviously refers to HCN, and its suspension in publication during Ch'en's imprisonment. The "reincarnated forms" refers to the many new periodicals that were started in this period.

Upon his release, Ch'en organised the New Youth Society (Hsin ch'ing-nien she 新青年社), and all the editors of HCN and its main contributors joined the society. In the winter of 1919, a Manifesto of New Youth Magazine (Hsin ch'ing-nien tsa-chih hsüan-yen 新青年雜誌宣言) was published, which expressed "the common opinion of all the members, and which is binding on all those who want to join the society".(14) This development reflected the greater political activism of the HCN intellectuals in the months following the May Fourth Incident. (The contents of the Manifesto will be examined in the following section.)

Early in 1920, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was forced to leave Peking and go to Shanghai. According to Hu Shih, the reason Ch'en had to do so was because he had broken his parole. In January, Ch'en had gone to Wuhan to stand in for Hu at a speaking engagement. (Hu was then busy in Peking interpreting for Dewey who had arrived in China on the very eve of the May Fourth Incident.) In going to Wuhan, Ch'en had in effect broken his parole, and he was thus forced to flee from Peking on his return. Also at the same time, his salary from Peking University was stopped, and it was agreed that Ch'en would resume sole editorial responsibility for HCN, and be paid a salary for it.(15)

3. The Tendency Towards Political Activism in the Pages of HCN.

The stormy events growing out of the May Fourth Incident were an education for the HCN intellectuals. Since 1915, they had preached that the struggle in the cultural sphere should take

precedence over political action. Then the events in mid-1919 demonstrated most dramatically the power of organised action of the students and workers. The success of such action was in sharp contrast to the long-term and prosaic cultural work which the new intellectuals had proposed. As we just saw, the HCN group were not just onlookers in the events of mid-1919. This experience was reflected in the pages of the magazine after it resumed publication.

The first clear indication of this was the "Manifesto of New Youth Magazine mentioned above. This was published in December 1919, and was unsigned, but was in fact penned by Ch'en Tu-hsiu and approved by the others.(16) (Because of the importance of this Manifesto, a complete translation of it is made in Appendix D.) The Manifesto was significant in two respects: firstly, it showed how the experience of the May Fourth Incident had modified the viewpoint of the HCN intellectuals, in particular that concerning political action; secondly, the document showed the beginning of the influence of socialist ideas (albeit those of idealistic socialism) in the ideology of HCN.)

The Manifesto began with a condemnation of militarism and mammonism in the world (17), which was no doubt derived from the experience of China's humiliation at the hands of the Great Powers at the Versailles Conference. This reflected the new intellectuals' bitter disillusionment with the "democratic and rational West", and was to contribute to the radicals' acceptance of Marxism, an ideology that was critical of the bourgeois Western society. The extent of this change in attitude towards the West will be examined more closely in the next section.

The next part of the Manifesto reads as follows.

> We believe that the old viewpoints in the politics, morals and economics of all countries in the world contain elements that both hamper progress and are unreasonable. If we want social progress, then we must destroy prejudices that are thought of as "unalterable truths" or as "established from old". We are determined, on the one hand to reject such old viewpoints, and on the other to combine the thoughts of ancient and contemporary thinkers and of our own, to create a new viewpoint in politics, morals and economics, and to raise high the spirit of the new era, so that we can adapt to the environment of the new society.(18)

Though this section is in a way a re-statement of what HCN had stood for since 1915, it is interesting in that it also refers to the need for changes in the political and economic spheres. The latter is further amplified in the next section which shows the influence of idealistic socialism.

> The new youth in our society will certainly respect labour. Labour will, according to the ability and interest of the individual, be regarded as something that is free, happy, artistic and beautiful. A sacred thing should not be regarded as a requisite for making a living.(19)

In view of the previous "apolitical" stand of HCN, the following reference to the political sphere is perhaps the most striking part of the Manifesto.

> We advocate mass movements and social reconstruction. We advocate having no relations at all with past and present political factions and parties. Although we do not believe in the omnipotence of politics, we accept that politics is an important aspect of public life. We also believe that genuine democratic politics will certainly share out political power to the entire people. If there be any limits, they will be based on the criteria whether somebody works or not, and not whether he has any wealth. <u>This kind of politics is an essential stage in the creation of the new era, and also a useful tool in the development of the new society.</u>(20, my emphasis)

What is significant about this discussion on politics is

that although the HCN intellectuals still rejected the existing political parties, they now maintained that political work was a necessary device for social reconstruction, and what is more, the political device they advocated was the organisation of mass movements. This represents a departure from their previous non-commitment to concrete political struggle, and also a lesson they had learnt from the events following the May Fourth Incident. The suggestion concerning mass movements may also be regarded as an embryonic idea that led to the radicals' later formation of the Chinese Communist Party, an act to create a new political instrument outside of the existing parties.

From a purely ideological point of view, this Manifesto published in December 1919 represented no dramatic change. The belief in democracy as a political virtue remained, now infused with an element of economic egalitarianism from idealistic socialism. But from the point of view of strategy, that is, what the new intellectuals believed they should be engaged in, the shift towards a greater political involvement was quite noticeable. Thus although Western bourgeois ideas still featured in the main in this Manifesto, and Marxist influence was not to be found, this document was an important part of HCN's leftward shift in this period.

In the same issue as the Manifesto, a new column, "Social Investigation" (She-hui tiao-ch'a 社會調查) was started. This again points to HCN's new interest and involvement in the actual socio-economic affairs of the country. The first of these investigations looked at the socio-economic reality of the city of Changsha, and included reports on the livelihood of the rickshaw-men, the middle-class, the industrial workers and the peasants.(21) Subsequent reports in this column dealt

with the conditions of Shantung peasants and the agricultural society in Shansi.

There are other indications to be found in the several issues of the magazine published after the May Fourth Incident that the HCN group were moving from a preoccupation with ideas to an active interest in the actual situation. Towards the end of 1919, a number of the new intellectuals (including Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, Li Ta-chao, Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Wang Hsing-kung, Kao I-han, Hu Shih, Lo Chia-lun, Chou Tso-jen and T'ao Meng-ho) organised the Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps (Kung-tu hu-chu t'uan 工讀互助團) in Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin and several other cities. The aim of the Corps was "to realise the cooperative spirit, and practise part-study-part-work". Each member of the Corps was expected to work for four hours a day. All income would go to the Corps which would in turn pay for the living and other basic expenses of each member.(22) A list of the people who donated money for the establishment of the Corps was published in the February 1920 issue of HCN, and it included the name of Chiang Kai-shek who contributed 10 yüan.(23) However, according to Ch'en Tu-hsiu, this experiment was not entirely successful, due to reasons of "a lack of determination, of a habit of labour, and of the skill of production".(24) Despite its failure, this experiment reflected the HCN intellectuals' diversification out of purely cultural matters.

The non-cultural aspect of their work was discussed by Ch'en Tu-hsiu in an article, "What is the New Culture Movement?", published in April 1920. He stressed that the movement should give attention to influencing other movements.

> When it comes to the influence of the New Culture Movement on military affairs, it is most essential that it should stop wars, and make military affairs an ally, and not

> an enemy, of the movement. When it comes to the influence of the New Culture Movement on property, it should make those who labour aware of their own position, and also to make the capitalists regard those who labour as "humans" of their own species and not as machines, beasts of burden or slaves. As for the influence of the New Culture Movement on politics, it should create new political thinking, and not be fettered to the existing politics.(25)

Ch'en then went on to describe the existing politics as "the in-fighting of dogs over scraps of bones", and called on his readers "to use a movement of humans to drive out this movement of dogs", and that they "should not forsake the movement of humans to join up with the movement of dogs!"(26)

In this period after the May Fourth Incident, Ch'en, like the other members of HCN, showed the influence of their experience in the protest movement. As we have seen in the Manifesto, the magazine was not only more resolute and direct in tone, but was also branching out from purely cultural and intellectual matters. Concomitant with this development was a change in attitude from a wholesale admiration of the West to a feeling of disenchantment, scepticism, even critisism. This again flowed from the events arising out of Versailles, and it is this change in attitude that we will now turn to.

4. The Disenchantment with the West.

As noted in the last chapter, the new intellectuals had entertained high hopes of an Allies' victory in the First World War, and that it would bring about a new world order based on rationality and justice. Then came the traumatic news from Versailles, and it was painfully obvious that China's interests had been betrayed by the self-interest of the Western powers, the very countries which the new intellectuals said China should emulate. This paradox was not to be easily resolved, and the subsequent disillusionment with the West

was quite apparent. In historical retrospect, this disenchantment was important in that it cleared a way emotionally for the radicals' subsequent acceptance of Marxism.

The new intellectuals' first reaction to the news from Versailles was well summed up by Li Ta-chao in May 1919.

> At the end of the war, we have entertained wild hopes of a victory for humanism and peace, that the world would no longer be a robbers' world, and that at last there would be a bit of humanity in the world. Who would have thought that these phrases are but the deceiving signboards of the robbers' governments?(27)

This feeling of bitter disappointment, even of animosity, towards the West was also apparent in HCN's Manifesto published in December 1919 and discussed in the last section. Part of the Manifesto reads as follows.

> We believe that the development of human morals should go beyond a life based on impulses (i.e. aggressiveness and possessiveness). Therefore, we should show feelings of friendship and cooperation towards every people in the world. But we must be hostile to the aggressive and possessive warlords and mammonists.(28, parenthesis in the original)

The sentiment of betrayal was perhaps best expressed by T'ao Meng-ho, who happened to be on an European visit and was in Paris when the news concerning Shantung broke. His attitude towards the West as expressed in an essay published in December 1919 contrasts sharply with that in a speech he made in November 1918 when he had spoken in the most glowing terms of post-war European politcs.(29) A year later, he related how things had changed.

> I arrived in Paris in May, and was promptly met with a blow on the head. This was the news that the three great powers had rejected our protest concerning Shantung. At the time, I thought back to the time during the war, when we frequently learnt of the news from overseas that the well-known governments of Europe and America were full of such good phrases as humanity, righteousness, self-determ-

> ination and peace. On hearing such kind and just noises, our spirits were really stirred up, for we were but little creatures that had been frequently bullied and had to petition to the peace conference. We thought that this conference would be a vital turning-point for mankind. The oppressed peoples of the world had pinned boundless hopes on this conference. ..... Who could have imagined that this conference was another great disappointment. It totally shattered the hopes of the peace-loving into nothing.(30)

This change in attitude towards the West was indeed historically significant. Before the May Fourth Incident, the HCN intellectuals were more preoccupied with emulating the West in order to solve China's problems than aware of the fact that China's plight was partly due to imperialism. The events flowing from the Versailles Conference brought this home, and at the same time shook their intellectual and emotional credulousness towards the West. Moreover, the intense patriotism of the months following May 1919 brought to the fore a nationalism that had little patience with the HCN brand of liberal internationalism. The defense of China against foreign imperialism was now much more important than trying to make the Chinese into a Western-thinking people.

In this concern for China's national interests, the movement away from the West was accompanied by an enhanced feeling of affinity with Soviet Russia. In July 1919, in the Karakhan Declaration, the new Soviet government offered to abrogate all secret and unequal treaties that had been forced on China by the Czarist government, and further to relinquish all Russian privileges and interests in China.(31) The news of the declaration did not reach China until March 1920, but when it did, it was met with a tremendous response and friendship from the Chinese people. This was followed by the Peking government's recognition of the Soviet government in September of that year. To Chinese intellectuals, the action of Soviet Russia in the

Karakhan Declaration was in stark contrast to what the Western powers did in Versailles. They were presented with the view of an aggressive self-seeking West , and a Soviet Russia that proclaimed that she was on the side of the oppressed peoples of the world. Thus, as the events of May Fourth diminished the influence of Western ideas, so this new affinity towards Russia helped to pave the way towards the acceptance of Marxism.

We have thus far followed the HCN intellectuals' participation in the events following the May Fourth Incident, and examined two developments flowing from it, namely the increasing political activism in its pages, and a post-May Fourth Incident disenchantment with the West. Also discernable in the issues of HCN after it had resumed publication in November 1919,was a growing interest in a variety of socialist ideas. In the period up to May 1920 when HCN came under the effective control of the Marxists, the "balance" of ideas in the pages of HCN was first in favour of Western bourgeois ideas , then this "balance" gradually swung towards a whole spectrum of socialist ideas until HCN emerged as a Marxist magazine. HCN's greater political activism and the disillusionment with the West were of course part of this process. So far, our examination of the discussion of socialist ideas in HCN has taken us up to the month before the May Fourth Incident. (See Chapter 2 Section 6) The issue of HCN published in the month of the May Fourth Incident was the special number on Marxism.

5. The Special Number on Marxism.

As we saw, by the beginning of 1919, Li Ta-chao had accepted the basic tenets of Marxism, although he was still far from a sophisticated understanding of the ideology. At this time, the editorship of the magazine was being taken in turn by members of

the editorial committee, and when it came to his turn, Li made his issue into a symposium on Marxism. It must be stressed again that his belief in the Marxist world-view was at this time outside of the mainstream of HCN ideology. Marxism still had very limited appeal with the new intellectuals, and none of the latter-day Marxists contributed to his symposium in this issue. Instead, the contributors were members of the Marxist Research Society which Li had organised in November 1918. None of the articles, including Li's, show a thorough grasp of Marxism, and what is of even greater interest is the fact that Li's article, "My Marxist View", was the only one that gave a sympathetic treatment and discussion of the ideology. At the same time, this special number of HCN on Marxism is of great historical interest in that it was the first serious and systematic discussion of Marxism by Chinese intellectuals. Moreover, the very fact that those who contributed to this symposium neither fully understood nor accepted Marxism, alone is of significance.

As to Li's decision to make this issue of HCN into a symposium on Marxism, he discussed this in the introduction to his own contribution. Li first noted the fact that Marx was a very prolific writer whose writings had filled many volumes, and then went on to say that an understanding of Marxism was made even more difficult by the fact that Marx's own argument varied slightly between his early and later writings.(32) Finally, he commented on his own degree of understanding of Marxism and why he thought Marxism was important.

> Normally I would not know much about Marxism. Now I am greatly overstepping myself in deliberately wanting to discuss Marxism. But ever since the Russian Revolution, it looks as if it is poised to sweep the world. The social revolutions in Germany, Austria and Hungary which took place in rapid succession, are all based on Marxism. Marxism, in accompanying this great upheaval in the world, has attracted

> the attention of the people of the world, and at the same time created numerous misunderstandings. ..... We are making use of the opportunity of this magazine's publication of a "special number on the study of Marxism" to introduce Marx to our readers, so that we will have a correct explanation in our thinking of this learning that is the moving force in the transformation of the world.(33)

In his article, "My Marxist view", Li expressed on the one hand his belief in the relevance of the Marxist ideology as a whole, and on the other made clear his lack of enthusiasm for one or two elements in Marxism. With respect to the latter, he discussed at some length the concept of economic determinism in Marxism. We have already seen that Li's first response to the Russian Revolution was more towards the act of revolution itself which he believed would herald a new era in world history, than towards the ideological base of the Bolsheviks. This belief in the importance and function of conscious action by men manifested again in this article in May 1919, and we see his attempt to reconcile it with Marxist tenets. He was not disposed to accept the Marxist conception that changes in the economic base was the prime mover of history, and was critical of Marx's argument that all social changes stem from economic changes.(34) Instead, he argued that "conscious organised action .... can change the tendency of the economic situation". Li gave the example of the work of the British trade unions, which he believed to have turned an economic situation detrimental to the workers to one favourable to them.(35) By the same token, Li was highly receptive to Marx's theory of the class struggle, since this was in tune with his own belief in the efficacy of conscious action by men.(36) At the same time, he argued that class struggle alone would not create history, and gave equal emphasis to the factor of "the human spirit".

> We advocate that we should use humanism to

> transform the human spirit, and at the same time use socialism to transform the economic organisation. Transforming the human spirit alone, without transforming the economic organisation, will have no effect. Transforming the economic organisation alone, without transforming the human spirit, will achieve no success either. We advocate the transformation of both the tangible and the intangible, and of both the flesh and the soul.(37)

The second part of Li's "My Marxist view" appeared in the next issue of HCN in November 1919, and this in the main consisted of a straightforward explanation of Marx's theories on surplus value and capital concentration. The only point of note from this second part is that Li was quite unreserved in his criticism of Marx's idea on surplus value.

> The theory on the value of labour is the foundation of Marxism. If the foundation is unstable, the entire body of learning will feel the effect. This has to be regarded as one of the major drawbacks of Marxism.(38)

The foregoing suggests that at this time Li had not accepted Marxism in toto. His concluding remark to the first part of "My Marxist view", which is much more telling of his thinking than the second part, amply illustrates this. He noted that "the birth of any learning is closely linked to its contemporary environment", and that Marxism was no exception, being the product of the industrial revolution during which economics came to be the most important sector of social life.

> Such an economic phenomenon was reflected in the creation of Marx's learning and ideology, but Marx himself forgot about this point. If we look calmly at his theory, it is really the product of an age. In Marx's time, it truly was the greatest discovery. Today, of course we cannot use a theory that has been created by the environment of one period to explain all of history, or to apply the whole of the theory to the society we live in. (39, emphasis my own)

However, Li's criticism of Marxism at this time should not be taken as a rejection of the ideology. The exception that he took to certain Marxist tenets, which stemmed from

his own intense belief in the power of conscious action by man, would be resolved later on. What is historically important about "My Marxist view" is not so much whether Li had totally accepted Marxism at the time, but the fact that the article was not only the first systematic exposition of Marxist ideas by a Chineseintellectual, but also shows that his thinking at the time was basically different to his HCN's colleagues. In addition, the points he raised in this article with respect to the appropriateness or adaptation of Marxism to the Chinese situation, in particular the relationship between economic conditions and conscious action, were to remain controversial issues within the Chinese Communist movement right up to the cultural revolution.

The other important point of note about "My Marxist view" is that it did not show any Leninist influences, or even the awareness of their existence. Thus Lenin's theory of imperialism was missing in the discussion of capital accumulation, while his idea of a vanguard revolutionary elite was conspiciously absent in Li's discussion of the class struggle. The explanation for this lies in the fact that the Leninist contributions to Marxism were as yet not known in China. One is tempted to conjecture that, had Lenin's ideas been known at the time, Li might have found the idea of a revolutionary vanguard an appropriate element to bridge the gap between his own belief in conscious action and Marx's idea of the nature of class struggle, and that he would have given Marxism a more enthusiastic endorsement in May 1919.

Chinese Communist historians of today give a great deal of importance to "My Marxist view" in the history of Marxism in China, not so much for its fidelity to the ideology, but for its contribution to the introduction of the ideology to China at the time.

> This essay, although still far from being concise or complete, certainly contains a discussion of the main components of Marxist thought. The essay also introduces certain major parts of the writings of the founder of Marxism. This kind of work was very much needed at the time.(40)

As mentioned, the other contributors to the symposium were members of the Marxist Research Society which Li had organised with some of his students in November 1918. It is curious that there were no contributions from those members of the Society who were later to become prominent Marxists, such as Teng Chung-hsia, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai and Chang Kuo-t'ao. Ku Chao-hsiung 顧兆熊 (Ku Meng-yü 顧孟餘), at the time a colleague of Li in the Faculty of History and later a leading member of the Kuomintang, made a contribution on "Marxist theory", in which he gave a critique of Marx's theories on historical materialism and economics, following closely the position of Bernstein.(41) Wang Wen-shan 王文山 , at the time an anarchist and later a prominent member of the Kuomintang, contributed a "Critique of Marx's theories", in which he clearly stated that he was following the ideas of Bernstein and Kropotkin,(42) Ch'en Ch'i-hsiu 陳啓修, who at the time did not regard himself as a Marxist and was never one, wrote an essay on "Marx's materialist conception of history and the chastity question", in which he argued that the advent of industrialisation would inevitably mean a liberalisation of the social mores concerning sexual relationships.(43)

Apart from Li's generally sympathetic discussion of Marx, the other contributions were in the main scholarly, sceptical or even distinctly critical of Marxism. It is interesting that this special number on Marxism also contained a biography of Bakunin, the ideological arch-rival of Marx. It could well be said that this issue of HCN was reflective of the limited

appeal Marxism had among the Chinese intellectuals of the time. The acceptance of Marxism was to be preceded by an interest in socialist ideas in general, and in the social and political philosophy of John Dewey, and it is towards a discussion of his influence that we now turn.

6. The Influence of Dewey.

The initial appeal of Dewey to the Chinese intellectuals lay in the fact that he represented one of the latest tendencies of Western learning. At the same time, the ideas of Dewey offered a seemingly more practical and detailed prescription for China than vague and general concepts such as liberalism and republicanism. The new intellectuals' perception of the May Fourth Incident led to a conviction that China should also be economically strong to resist pressures from the Great Powers.

Dewey was invited to visit China by an educational organisation. He arrived in China three days before the May Fourth Incident, ans stayed for just over two years. On his arrival, Dewey was welcomed by Hu Shih, who had long been a strong advocate of Dewey's pragmatic philosophy since his student days in the United States. He interpreted for Dewey on his lecture tours and also greatly popularised Dewey's ideas in his writings. For our present purpose, it is important to examine not so much the whole body of Dewey's ideas, but which of these ideas were deemed important by the Chinese new intellectuals and the way they were interpreted.

On the most general level, the new intellectuals regarded Deweyism as a method of thought, as the latest development in the scientific spirit of the West. We have already noted Hu Shih's own assessment of Dewey's pragmatism on his sceptical mode of thinking by which he regarded "all learning and thoughts

as hypotheses awaiting verification".(44) This pragmatic and sceptical approach was shared by Hu's colleagues on HCN. A section of the magazine's Manifesto, published in December 1919, declared that:

> We believe that the prerequisite for progress in our society is a respect for natural sciences and pragmatic philosophy, and the destruction of superstition and fantasy.(45)

This belief was very much part of the emphasis on the importance of science and scientific spirit at the time, and so what is of greater interest is the extent of the influence of Dewey's social and political philosophy. HCN's main discussion of these ideas was a transcription of a series of lectures entitled "Social and political philosophy" which was delivered by Dewey at Peking University in the winter of 1919 and interpreted by Hu Shih. Dewey's main theme in this series of lectures was that a society or system was the product of gradual historical evolution, and thus any effort to improve it should not be based on any extreme solution, but that the society's problems should first be studied individually and then the solution for each derived through experimentation. There should thus be a demand for evidence for the purpose of verification, and a related wariness against theories offering panacea. In other words, society could only be improved at a gradual pace, and this was the underlying element in Dewey's social and political philosophy. (46)

Coming on to the more specific ideas of Deweyism and their influences on the new intellectuals, one would do well to examine Ch'en Tu-hsiu's article, "Foundation for the realisation of democracy" published in HCN in December 1919. In this article, Ch'en's thinking was reflective of the myriad of ideas that were in the ideology of HCN at the time. Hu Shih was inclined to accept Dewey's ideas in toto (and we shall be examining his

thinking more closely in the following section). As for Li Ta-chao, he had by then declared his interest in Marxism. Moreover, in this article Ch'en made direct comments on various aspects of Dewey's ideas, and thus indicating the extent of their influences on him.

Ch'en began with a definition of democracy by quoting with approval Dewey's definition of the four essential elements of democracy.

> 1. Political democracy. This consists of using the constitution to guarantee against any abuse of power, and of using a representative legislation system to express the people's wishes.
> 2. Democracy in civil rights. This consists of giving attention to the rights of the people, such as the freedom of speech, the freedom of publication, the freedom of belief and the freedom of domicile
> 3. Social democracy. This is the same as egalitarianism, such as in the abolition of unequal classes and class ideologies, and in the promotion of equality in personality.
> 4. Economic democracy. This is the abolition of unfair economics to achieve an equitable distribution of wealth.(47)

Ch'en believed that the first two points were concerned with political democracy, and the latter two with economic democracy. On political democracy, he largely agreed with Dewey but with one qualification. Ch'en believed that constitutionalism and representation alone were not enough to guarantee the interests of the people, but that there should be no division at all between the ruled and the ruler. He advocated a method of "direct legislation", in which the ruled and the ruling would be the same.(48)

In his lectures, Dewey divided various problems into three categories: the political, the intellectual and the economic. Of the three, Dewey believed that economic problems were the most important, referring to economics as "the basis of social life".(49) On this point, Ch'en also gave prominence to the question of economics in a society.

> I believe that measures concerning a society's economics should take up the greater part of politics. Moreover, if the economic problems of a society remain unsolved, then neither can any important political problem be solved. A society's economics is the foundation of its politics.(50)

Such a statement should not be interpreted to mean that Ch'en was at the time coming under the influence of Marxism. If one examines his thinking in the first months after the May Fourth Incident (as we will be in Section 9), one can see that he was still far from any definite Marxist influences at that time, but was rather following a number of ideas. His thinking on economic affairs at that time came partly from Dewey. Dewey was critical of both laissez faire capitalism and Marxist economics, his criticism of the latter being that it would destroy individual initiative while still being unable to abolish the privileges of the bourgeoisie.(51) Dewey believed that these two drawbacks would be eliminated by guild socialism in which democratically-run trade syndicates would work for the public good.(52) In a similar vein, Ch'en proposed the formation of "trade organisations" (t'ung-yeh lien-ho 同業聯合), giving as his reason that there was no great difference in position between the employers and employees in most Chinese enterprises! (53)

On the matter of political democracy, Ch'en also based himself on Dewey in his proposal for the development of local government units, in fact quoting Dewey directly in support of his argument. In an article on "The development of democracy in the United States", Dewey described how the American democratic system had evolved out of the development and amalgamation of self-governing towns and villages.(54) Ch'en argued that China should follow a similar development.

> A large-scale democratic system must be built on the foundation of democracy in small-scale organisations. ..... In political democracy,

> Britain and America are more developed than other countries. The reason for their advanced development is that through the years, many small-scale units of local self-governing organisations and trade organisations have grouped together to create today's large-scale democracy. ..... If we want to implement democracy today, we should follow the examples of Britain and America.(55)

It might be said that Dewey's influence on the Chinese new intellectuals was sharp but short-lived. His arrival in China and the subsequent highly successful lecture-tour was at a time when the new intellectuals had just had a traumatic experience with the Western powers. His criticism of orthodox capitalism did not fall on deaf ears, and his proposed course of action of economic development in some form of guild socialism was also attractive to those who were searching for a way to make China economically strong. His political philosophy for democracy and his pragmatic approach in thinking were both in tune with the ideology of the New Culture Movement. His influence was undoubtedly strongest and most long-lasting on Hu Shih. Going by the foregoing, one might imagine from this that Ch'en Tu-hsiu was also greatly influenced. However, as we shall see, Ch'en in this period was quite fastidious in the ideas he supported and proposed. The influence of Deweyism waned with the realisation that China's immense problems could not be easily solved by a Western-form political democracy and a form of controlled capitalistic development. Moreover, the methods which Deweyism proposed would require in themselves years of prosaic work which did not make them very attractive in an observed total crisis.

Yet the ideas of John Dewey had their consequences in China. One of these was that Deweyism helped to turn the new intellectuals' attention to the question of economics in the process of social development. In this respect, Deweyism was another element that helped to pave the way towards an acceptance of Marxism. A more visible consequence of Deweyism was the "Problems & Isms" debate

that developed in the summer of 1919. This we will now turn to.

7. The "Problems & Isms" Debate, Summer 1919.

The two protagonists in this debate were Hu Shih and Li Ta-chao, and the basic issue of the debate was whether China's problems should be solved by gradual, evolutionary and essentially non-political means, or by a political and more total revolution. The debate took place in the latter half of 1919, and indicates the new intellectuals' heightened sense of urgency and concern over the state of the country following the events at Versailles. Apart from the basic question of the tempo of change in China, the related vital questions of what kind of political and economic system China should have and what attitude should be taken towards the Peking government, also came up in the debate. The "Problems & Isms" debate was the first open manifestation of a split in the united front of the HCN intellectuals. In the earlier New Culture Movement, they had worked collaboratively in the common belief that a cultural transformation of their countrymen was the most urgent task at hand. But the developments arising out of the events in 1919 and Li Ta-chao's conversion to Marxism quickly brought differences to the fore.

Writing in 1922, Hu explained why he initiated this debate in the summer of 1919.

> Atthat time the Anfu Club was at the height of its power, and the spoils-sharing peace conference (between the North and the South) was still in progress. But the "new" elements in the country flatly refused to discuss concrete political questions, but expansively talked about such things as anarchism and Marxism. I could not bear the sight of this, and I could not control myself, because I am a disciple of pragmatism. Thus I made up my mind to talk about politics. In Weekly Critic No.31, I brought out the foreword to my ideas on politics, and it is called "More study of problems, less talk of isms."(56)

At this time, the publication of HCN was suspended temporarily

because of the interruption of the May Fourth Incident, and since Ch'en Tu-hsiu was in prison, Hu Shih was standing in for him as editor of the Weekly Critic, the magazine that Ch'en and Li Ta-chao had established in December 1918.(57) In his article,"More study of problems, less talk of isms", Hu dealt primarily with what he believed to be the correct approach to social and political problems. He urged his colleagues to concern themselves with concrete issues, and not to indulge in the discussion of vague and abstract ideologies. He criticised those who followed foreign doctrines and did not understand that all doctrines were the products of particular times and environments, and hence not necessarily appropriate to the Chinese situation. He contended that generalised abstractions would at best only make their followers "complacent and satisfied" with the belief that they had a magical formula offering a "fundamental solution" of all problems, and at worst they would be dangerous in the hands of unscrupulous politicians who used such doctrines as a smokescreen to further their private ends. In the lattter respect, Hu believed that ideologies such as socialism and anarchism were particularly dangerous since they could easily be interpreted in different ways. He argued that in place of all-embracing ideologies, various doctrines should develop from concrete experience that could only be obtained from the study of specific problems, and these problems could only be solved individually, each in its own way. He concluded that there was no single ideology that can solve all of China's problems all at once.(58)

Lan Kung-wu 藍公武, a member of the Progressive Party, was the first to answer Hu Shih. At the time, some members of theProgressive Party were advocates of guild socialism, and Lan argued that the

propagation of an ideology would be the first step towards the solution of the problems. The reason for this, Lan pointed out, was that the knowledge of an ideology would help to reveal the existence of problems, the fact that they were often inter-related, and the way to their solution.(59)

Li Ta-chao joined in the debate in August, just under a mouth after the publication of Hu's article. Li argued for the necessity of "a fundamental solution" and ideology from two points of view. Firstly, Li believed that in a country as "ill-organised and as stagnant" as China, with its various sectors in a backward state, there had to be a fundamental change before there was any hope of dealing effectively with individual problems. Li gave the example of the Russian Revolution in which only the Bolsheviks' overthrow of the Romanovs and their drastic reorganisation of the economy made possible the solution of individual problems.(60) Secondly, he asserted that ideology was essential to mobilise "the majority of the people" to effect social change. In this respect, ideology served the function of creating the consciousness that linked people's problems to those of society. Such a consciousness, he believed, would give the people the hope and aspiration and "a common direction" by which problems could be solved.(61)

After this disucssion of the function of ideology, Li went on to state his case for the adoption of Marxism in China, and more significantly, why he thought Marxism should be adapted to the Chinese situation.

> If a socialist wants his ideology to influence the world, he must study to see how his ideas should be adapted to suit the concrete conditions around him. Thus in contemporary socialism there are a great number of attempts to take the spirit of socialism and change it into something practical to comply with the needs of the present. This shows that the basic characteristic of an ideology contains the possibility of adapting itself to reality. (62)

These two articles by Hu Shih and Li Ta-chao, respectively "More study of problems, less talk of isms" published in July 1919, and "Again on problems and isms" published in August 1919, both appeared in Weekly Critic. But in September the magazine was suppressed by the Peking government, and the venue of debate was moved to Pacific Ocean (T'ai-p'ing-yang 太平洋), a monthly established by some of the former members of Tiger Magazine. (See Appendix B for further details.) In the November issue of Pacific Ocean, Hu Shih published "A third discussion of problems and isms" and "A fourth discussion of problems and isms", and reiterated his belief that isms should not be regarded as inviolable and sacrosanct panacea, but the solutions to various problems could only be formulated from concrete and continuous study of the problems themselves.(63)

A summary of Hu Shih's argument in the "Problems and isms" is to be found in his essay, "The meaning of the new thought tide", published in the December 1919 issue of HCN. He set forth five reasons for the study of problems: (1) A study of the concrete problems of society would attract everybody's attention; (2) such a study would bound to stir up opposition, and any consequent argument could only help to bring out the truth; (3) if the problems were "living" ones that affected the people, a study of them was likely to create an awareness in people; (4) the study of problems would be the best way to introduce new learning, since it would make the process of learning a subconscious one; (5) the study of problems would cultivate a group of people that were critical, independent in thought and able in reform (64); Hu concluded:

> The spirit of the new thought tide is the critical spirit.
> The methods of the new thought tide are the study of problems and the introduction of new learning.
> In my opinion, the future tendency of the new thought tide should give emphasis to

> the study of the important human and social problems, and the introduction of new learning should be done through the study of problems.
> .....
> What is the one and only aim of the new thought tide? It is to recreate culture!
> Civilisation has not been created over-night. It has been created inch by inch, and drop by drop. Progress can only be achieved inch by inch, and drop by drop.
> .....
> The approach to the recreation of culture is to study individual problems. Progress in the recreation of culture consists of the solution of individual problems.(65)

It is clear from this passage that Hu Shih put his faith in a gradualist and reformist approach, and that the influence of pragmatism on Hu Shih's thinking was quite pronounced. He also retained his faith in the efficacy of prdominantly cultural methods in the solution of social problems. His thinking was fundamentally different to that of Li Ta-chao. In an essay on "An economic explanation of the causes of the changes in modern Chinese thought", published in HCN in January 1920, Li gave an orthodox Marxist view of social changes.

> In an era, changes in the economy are always followed by changes in thought. In other words, economic change is the important reason for any cultural changes.(66)

Li then went on to argue that the reason why Confucianism was able to dominate Chinese minds for over two thousand years was not because of any intrinsic value in the ideology, but because it was a product or reflection of the agrarian-economic organisation of China which remained unchanged for over two thousand years.(67) The implication of this postulation was of course that any cultural approach to China's problems would only have a piecemeal effect, and would only be dealing with the symtoms and not the causes of the problems.

Indeed, although the "Problems and isms" debate was couched in more or less philosophical and academic terms, the real point of issue between Hu and Li was how the immediate and closely-

felt crisis of China should be resolved, whether by a political revolution on the model of the Russian one, or by gradual and evolutionary reforms such as in the West. In other words: which road should China take? Chinese Communist historians of today see this debate in 1919 in the following light.

> This debate is a struggle in thought and methodology between Li Ta-chao and Hu Shih -- respectively the representative figure of proletarian thought in the May Fourth cultural movement, and the representative figure of liberal, bourgeois thought which is prone to compromise and capitulati . It (the debate) is also an important struggle in thought after the birth of Marxism in China.(68)

Although, as we have seen, Marxism did not have any wide appeal at the time of the debate, Hu felt that Marxism and the other "all-embracing" ideologies, such as anarchism, which he criticised, might endanger and transform the nature of the movement as he viewed it. In the months after the May Fourth Incident, with a heightened sense of urgency and activism among the new intellectuals, Hu Shih's disquiet was real enough, but this also meant that he was increasingly fighting against the sweep of events. The desire and determination to transform China into a strong nation was predominant in the minds of many patriotic youths, and to them Hu Shih's gradualistic and reformist program presented a prospect of a seemingly endless struggle with little possibility of dramatic success. This was not an attractive proposition in the mood of the time, and hu's own reluctance to involve himself in political affairs diminished his credibility and influence. In the years to come, the turbulent situation in China was to force him to make his own definite political commitment, and he came to an accomodation with the Kuomintang.

Thus the "Problems and isms" debate in the summer of 1919 was in many ways a trailer for the events that were to unfold.

The debate was also the first open and consciously-felt divergence in the ranks of the NCN intellectuals. The earlier united front was now developing into the first stage of a situation of two opposing camps. It was the first occasion in which different opinions on the appropriate course for China's future created a public dispute among the leaders of the new intelligentsia. From the ideological point of view, the "Problems & Isms" debate also raised some of the questions that were to be the subject of contention among Chinese intellectual and political leaders in later years. Li Ta-chao was the first member of China's first generation of Marxists, while Hu Shih remained the spokesman for liberalism in China. Before we look at the change in Ch'en Tu-hsiu's thinking and his acceptance in Marxism by mid 1920, we shall now first describe the variety of socialist ideas and the extent of their appeal in the months after May Fourth.

8. THE NEW INTEREST IN SOCIALIST IDEAS

The impact of the May Fourth Incident brought about a wider appeal for socialist ideas in two ways. Firstly, the new intellectuals who had been bemoaning the backwardness of China now came to realise that the plight of their country was even more serious than they had pictured. They now saw that the problems facing their country were not entirely due to the cultural inferiority in thought of the Chinese people, and the patriotic demonstrations in May and June showed that the people were capable of activism. Rather, the new intellectuals now realised that the Chinese nation was facing a more total crisis, and all aspects of Chinese society needed renovation. In this respect, they felt that one of the more important tasks was to strengthen the country economically. Hence in the months following May Fourth, there arose the debate as to whether China should follow the capitalistic or socialist mode of development. The sense of crisis at the time and the determination to quickly build up China's strength were both conducive to a

consideration of socialism. The second development that was favourable to socialism in the post-May Fourth months was the realisation that the capitalist West was the source of China's humiliation at Versailles. Hence there was the feeling of disenchantment which we have described in Section 4. It was felt that, since China was still at an early stage of economic development, she would be able to avoid the pitfalls and mistakes of Western capitalism. In this respect, socialism, as a Western ideology that was itself critical of the status quo in the West, seemed an appropriate programme for China.

There was a whole variety of socialist ideas that caught the interest of Chinese intellectuals at this time: from utopian socialism to guild socialism, form anarchism to Marxism, and such other ideas as the agrarian co-operativism of Tolstoy and the Japanese New Village Movement. Each of these ideas had its followers in China, and the vogue for socialist ideas was such that there were even societies for the study of socialism set up by members of the conservative Anfu Club. In December 1919, a Society for the Study of Socialism (She-hui chu-i yen-chiu hui 社會主義研究會) was established in Peking University, and according to one source, its members included Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Li Ta-chao, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, Teng Chung-hsia, Chang Kuo-t'ao, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.(69)

In this initial enthusiasm, there was little conscious delineation between the various sects in socialism. It was not uncommon to see the influences of several different socialist ideas in one person or group. An indication of this phenomenon is that the Society for the Study of Socialism later split into separate societies for the study of guild socialism, syndicalist socialism, and Marxism.(70)

This interest in a multitude of socialist ideas was amply reflected in the pages of HCN after it had resumed publication in November 1919. Indeed, the tendency towards political activism, the disenchantment with the Western Powers, and this interest in socialist ideas were three developments that had grown directly

out of the events of May Fourth; they constituted the three new important elements in the intellectual climate of the post-MayFourth months, and were all reflected in the pages of HCN.

The Manifesto of HCN published in December 1919 (discussed in Section 3), contained both the influences of socialism, in particular that of the utopian socialists, and an indication of Hu Shih's disquiet over the enthusiam for isms at that time. On the one hand, the Manifesto condemned "militarism and mammonism in the world" and extolled "the sacredness of labour"(71), and on the other, it confirmed a belief in pragmatism.(72) In this respect, the Manifesto was a transitional document of compromise, but at the same time both the whole "Problems & Isms" debate in the previous summer as initiated by Hu Shih, and now the Manifesto in December, may be regarded as an indication of the growing interest in socialism and Hu Shih's justified concern over such a development. It could also be said that the lectures and writings of John Dewey, some of which were published in the HCN, also helped to turn the attention of the new intellectuals to economic problems.

Mention was made in the last chapter of the interest in the Japanese New Village Movement. In July 1919, Chou Tso-jen visited some of the"new villages"in Japan, and upon his return made several speeches(73), the text of one of which was reprinted in the January 1920 issue of HCN. Chou asserted that the aim of the movement was "for the achievement of the life of the good person", and that it was underlined by two fundamental principles.

> Firstly each person should fulfil his duty to engage in labour, and then he will receive, free of charge, the essentials for a healthy life. Secondly, all men are equal. On the one hand, a person fulfils his duty to mankind, and on the other develops his own personality.(74)

For a time after the May Fourth Incident, this New Village Movement created an impression on the new intellectuals. Its basic philosophy was inspired by Tolstoy, Kropotkin and the utopian socialists.

Lu Hsün made a translation of a play, "A Youth's Dream", written by Mushakoji, the founder of the movement.(75) In the February 1920 issue of HCN, Chou Tso-jen further translated Mushakoji's letter to his "Chinese friends unknown", and this was appended with the enthusiastic replies from Lu himself, Chou Tso-jen, Ts'ai Yüen-p'ei and Ch'en Tu-hsiu.(76) At one time, there were study groups of the movement in several of the main cities in China, and some of the members went to Japan to study the "new villages" first-hand.(77)

The January 1920 issue of HCN carried an essay by T'ao Meng-ho on "The labour question in Europe and America". Before the May Fourth Incident, T'ao, a professor of social sciences at Peita, had been a most ardent advocate of Westernisation. We have already noted in (Chapter 3, Section 4) T'ao's reaction of bitter disappointment, if not of resentment, over what happened at Versailles. In this essay, he discussed the causes of "the restlessness of labour" in the West. He did not agree with Marx on the polarisation of two classes in an industrial society, but still maintained that "the focus of the labour question" was the fact that the labouring class demanded their share of "the material and spiritual civilisation which mankind should enjoy."(78) He then went on to note that he believed the governments of the Western nations would not and could not solve the labour question, which he described as the most basic problem in the post-war West. He described the Lloyd George's government in Britain as being controlled by the capitalists, the American government as both pro-capitalist and corrupt, and the Clemenceau government in France as waging imperialism abroad to draw attention away from the labour question at home.(79) In conclusion, T'ao believed that the labour question in the West could only be solved by all social classes co-operating together in order to bring about, by peaceful means, a system of "democratic public ownership". T'ao was specific in pointing out that he did not take "democratic public ownership" to mean nationalisation, which he criticised as

"bureaucratic".(80) However, he did not spell out how such a system could be brought about or what concrete form it would take. In fact, his essay contains the influences of a whole array of socialist ideas, from utopian socialism to elements of Marxism. In a way, the essay is a microcosm of the myriad of socialist ideas to be found in the pages of HCN at this time. Taken as a whole, it both reflects the interest in socialism, and yet is ambiguous in its proposals.

But the discussion of socialist ideas in HCN at this time was not confined simply to general and academic argument. Mention has already been made of the new column, "Social Investigation", which was started in December 1919 and consisted of reports into the socio-economic conditions in various localities of the country. We have also described the Work-and-Study Co-operative Corps which was organised towards the end of 1919 by the new intellectuals in an attempt to create the communal spirit in their own life-style. Although the experiment was short-lived and without much consequence, it illustrates the new intellectuals' enthusiasm with socialist ideas.

The leftward shift in HCN's editorial policy was part of a similar tendency in the outlook of the new intellectuals in the months after the May Fourth Incident. Li Ta-chao's early interest in Marxism not only stood out in that it developed before May 1919, but was also significant in Li's relative fidelity to Marxism as compared with some of his colleagues who were likely to be under the influence of several socialist ideas at any one time. Li's article, "My Marxist View", published in May 1919, was at that time the most systematic and knowledgeable treatment of the subject written by a member of the Chinese new intelligentsia. In this new interest in socialist ideas, some of the new intellectuals were ignorant of the ideological differences between various ideas, and tended to regard "socialism" as an amorphous body of ideas. Some believed Marxism to include not only Bolshevism, but also the ideas of Kautsky, and even those of Bernstein, syndicalism and guild

socialism. Then there were those who believed that Bolshevism was but a part of anarchism, while still others believed that socialism was made up of the two components of the collectivism of Marx and the anarchism of Kropotkin.(81) Thus an examination of Li Ta-chao's view of Marxism at this time is important in that he was in some way the only important new intellectual who possessed an intimate knowledge of Marxism.

We saw that Li, in his "My Marxist View" published in May 1919, made clear that he believed that "the human spirit" was as important a factor as the class struggle in the creation of history. This emphasis on the spiritual factor came partly from the ideology of the New Culture Movement and partly from Li's earlier conception of history. But the turbulent course of the May Fourth Incident and the subsequent "Problems & Isms" debate made Li think again on this point. Thus in his polemics with Hu Shih about the efficacy of a fundamental solution, Li now declared that the transformation of the economic structure underpinned the solution of all other problems.

> When there is a change in the economic structure, then all (in the superstructure) will also change. In other words, the solution of the economic problem is the fundamental solution. When that is solved, then all political and legal problems, as well as the problems of the family system, women's liberation and workers' liberation, can also be solved.(82, my parenthesis)

Li then went on to assert that the economic problem could only be solved by a mass movement in the form of a class struggle. Li was, by this time, firmly committed to Marxism, and a greater Marxist sophistication is also in evidence in his writings then. In his essay, "An economic explanation of the causes of the changes in modern Chinese thought", he made the important observation that the Chinese situation was part of the development of world revolution.

> The proletariat that exist under the oppression of the capitalist system of a particular country still have the opportunity to make use of the productive organisations of the capitalists. The world's proletariat that exists under the oppression of the world's capitalist system has no opportunity to make use of the productive organisations of the capitalist countries..... The economic changes that occur in Europe and America are the consequences of natural internal developments. The economic changes that occur in China are the consequences of foreign pressures. Thus the sufferings of the Chinese people are even greater, and their sacrafices are even more.(83)

The above postulation by Li is significant in two respects. Firstly, in the atmosphere of nationalistic fervour of the post-May Fourth months, Li's Marxist thinking was not detracted by his nationalism. His Marxist reasoning led him to the conclusion that the plight of China was not entirely due to native capitalism, but also due to foreign imperialism. As we should see later, this followed closely the Leninist theory of imperialism which was to be a significant factor in the conversion to Marxism of some of the other new intellectuals. Secondly, in making a link between the Chinese and the world revolution, Li foreshadowed a similar theory of Mao Tse-tung. Both men shared the view that, like the October Revolution, the Chinese revolution was part of the development towards world revolution in the sense that China occupied a proletarian status in the world economy vis-a-vis imperialism. Thus the liberation of China would not only mean the defeat of native Chinese capitalism but also the defeat of foreign imperialism; such a defeat would in turn contribute towards the world revolution.

We mentioned that, at the time of the Special Number on Marxism published in May 1919, Li's Marxist ideas were more of a side tendency than part of the mainstream of NCM's ideology at the time. Now in the post-May Fourth months, as we have just seen, the rapid development of the interest in socialist ideas had shifted the magazine's ideology leftward to a postion closer to that of Li. At the same time, this new interest was too general and newly-developed to be considered as the sole decisive factor

that led to HCN's becoming a Marxist magazine. There were also the tendencies towards political activism and the disenchantment with the Western Powers. These factors were all closely related and accentuated each other. In the context of a history of HCN, another important factor was the conversion to Marxism of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, and it is this process that we will now examine.

9. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CH'EN TU-HSIU'S COMMITMENT TO MARXISM

The analysis of Ch'en's thinking undertaken in this section will cover the months between the end of 1919 and the middle of 1920. In more ways than one, Ch'en was the most representative figure of the change in political attitude of the new intellectuals in this period. The fact that Ch'en had resumed sole editorial responsibility for HCN early in 1920 meant that his commitment to Marxism in the middle of 1920 was an important factor in HCN's becoming a Marxist magazine by the end of 1920. As we will see in this Section, Ch'en Tu-hsiu in this period was successively influenced by the events of the May Fourth incident, the ideas of Dewey, the "Problems & Isms" debate and a multitude of socialist ideas. Thus this examination of Ch'en's thinking in this period can also serve as a useful summary of the preceding sections and lead on to the later sections where we will look at the final, open and irrevocable split in the ranks of the HCN intellectuals.

When Ch'en was released from prison in September 1919, his ideas still showed many of the humanitarian and internationalist sentiments of the New Cultural Movement. In answer to the poems written by his friends on HCN to celebrate his release, Ch'en wrote a long poem expressing his belief that all men were brothers and basically good.

> The brother who picks up a gun and shoots down
> his brothers,
> Naturally we hate him;
> The brother who is idle and lives off other brothers,
> Naturally we curse him;

The brother who, clutching the tablets of his ancestors,
marches in the direction of darkness,
Naturally we are annoyed with him;
The brother who harms others for his own benefit,
and still tell lies,
Naturally we rebuke him;
But the brothers and sisters who are patient and
understanding,
Do not hate him, do not curse him, do not be
annoyed with him, and do not rebuke him.
They pour out their sympathetic tears to give their
brothers the baptism of adulthood.
The brothers who have been baptised will inevitably
lay down their guns and their ancestors' tablets,
And together with the brothers who work and who
speak the truth,
March towards brightness.(84)

This humanitarianism and almost evangelical concern for mankind is also evident in the Manifesto of HCN, published in December 1919, which was penned by Ch'en and approved by the others.(85) In the same issue of HCN as the Manifesto, Ch'en also made a comparison between the Bolsheviks and their critics. He made clear that he was judging neither side from the ideological point of view, but simply by the standard whether each side was conducive or detrimental to world peace. On this point, he believed that the Bolsheviks were peace-loving, while their opponents "still carry within them militaristic and aggressive ideas, and cannot rid themselves of selfish, individualistic, one-class and one-country thoughts".(86) As we have seen, such anti-Western sentiments were prevalent after Versailles, while the Soviet government compared very favourably in this light.

But apart from Li Ta-chao, the new intellectuals' view of Soviet Russia was based more on the nationalistic view that Russia was not doing anything to harm China, than any ideological attraction to Bolshevism. Ch'en Tu-hsiu at this time was no exception. We saw in Section 6 in the analysis of Ch'en's essay, "Foundation for the realisation of democracy", published in December 1919, that Ch'en followed quite closely Dewey's gradualist programme of social and political reforms, and had formerly stated that China should emulate the American and British models. The influence of Dewey's pragmatism

was also evident in Ch'en's writings in this period.

> I always have two beliefs. The first is that evolution is forever infinite. Since time immemorial, a good philosophy can only remedy the shortcomings of one particular age. There is no such holy man as "the immortal sage" in time, and there is no system that "can be rightly applied to all eras". The second is that in a complex human society, there are only specific truths which can be used as ideas to remedy individual shortcomings. There is no such thing as a panacea.(87)

Ch'en then went on to list several of the contemporary thoughts which he was sceptical about: Malthus' theory of population, Darwin's theory of natural elimination, Nietzsche's theory of freedom, Kropotkin's cooperativism and Marx's historical materialism. He believed that these "fallacies and superstition" would be "great hindrances" to the discussion of social problems.(88) Indeed, in the "Problems & Isms" debate in the summer of 1919, Li Ta-chao had criticised both Ch'en and Hu Shih for their refusal to discuss the ideas of the Bolsheviks.(89)

Yet less than a year later, in mid-1920, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was to be totally committed to Marxism. How did this change come about? In the years before May Fourth, Ch'en had believed passionately in Western democracy and science as the keys to China's salvation, and that a transformation of the thought of the Chinese people based on these two elements was the correct approach and prerequisite to changing the country. As with the other new intellectuals, his perspectives changed drastically as a result of the May Fourth Incident. Firstly, he no longer viewed the West as the bastion of reason and democracy, not when the great powers were responsible for China's degradation at Versailles. How could China's tormentors also be her mentors? What took place in Versailles had not only showed up the Western powers as aggressive

imperialists, but also demonstrated the utter impotence of China. This explains the popularity of socialist ideas among the new intellectuals in the post-May Fourth months, since these ideas were not only critical of the West, but were also believed to contain a course by which China could rapidly strengthen herself economically. Secondly, the outbreak and course of the protest movement, but its very intensity and successes, had demonstrated the superior efficacy of mass action over cultural work. In particular, the workers' strikes in June 1919 had drawn the new intellectuals' attention to the political potential of the workers. This awareness and the new interest in socialism interacted and accentuated each other in the course of the months after May Fourth. In contrast, the gradual evolution envisaged in Dewey's programme would seem to be painfully slow in an observed situation of total crisis.

As the interest in socialism developed, so did an awareness and knowledge of Soviet Russia. The new intellectuals were presented with the spectacle of a vast historic transformation led by a small group of men whose motivations were not unlike their own, and in a country formerly suffering from social and political ills not dissimilar to those of China. Towards the end of 1919, Hu Han-min, a leading figure in the Kuomintang, had written an analysis of traditional Chinese thought and institutions from the point of view of historical materialism. Although he very much stressed the nationalistic implications of his analysis, this indicates a growing interest in Marxism.(90) In November 1919, Tai Chi-t'ao, another leading figure in the Kuomintang, began a translation of parts of Marx's Das Kapital (91), while the Communist Manifesto was translated in full for the first time and published in April 1920 in a students' monthly, Citizens

(Kuo-min 國民).(92) Thereafter, translations of the writings of Marx and Engels progressively appeared in Chinese publications.

Although the writings of Lenin were not systematically translated until 1921, his ideas were not unknown to the new intellectuals from 1920. The Comintern agent, Voitinsky, arrived in China in March 1920, and we shall be looking at the origin and early activities of the Chinese Communist movement in a later section. Lenin's conception of a revolutionary movement led by a vanguard of dedicated men must have struck a chord in the minds of the new intellectuals. Furthermore, Bolshevism offered not only the prospect of a fundamental transformation of the Chinese situation, but also a rapid one to a strong and just society. Finally, the Leninist theory of imperialism offered the new intellectuals an ideological explanation of the world's situation as they already perceived it: the Western capitalist governments were bullying and exploiting the poor and weak countries in the world.

By May 1920, Ch'en Tu-hsiu had considered and rejected the capitalist mode of economic development for China on the ground that capitalism was grossly unfair and inhumane to the workers. The May issue of HCN was a special Labour Day commemorative number; it contained nearly four hundred pages (twice the normal number of pages) and is a good indication of the growing interest in socialist ideas. In a reply to a reader's letter concerning workers' education and savings, Ch'en declared his opposition to capitalism.

> There are many in society who have money but do no work, so why must we force the workers to have more time for education while their working hours are not reduced. The value produced by the labour of the workers far exceed their daily wages. They are totally robbed of this surplus value by the capitalists. ..... You (the reader) suggest that the labour

> question should be looked at from the point of view of benefit for the whole society, this is very true indeed.(93, my parenthesis)

In the same issue, there is also the text of a speech Ch'en made to a shipping workers' union at the time. In it, he asserted that "the awareness of the labouring people of the world" developed in two stages. The first was the demand for ruling power.(94).

> The first stage is still begging from people. The privileges of those who labour are only secured when they own not only the oil, salt, wood, rice and vegetables they eat, but also the cooking utensils and crockery they cook and eat with. Otherwise, however well they are treated, they are still dependent on others' kindness. There is an ancient saying, "Those who labour with their minds rule over those who labour with their hands." We must now change this saying round so that "Those who labour with their hands rule over those who labour with their minds". There is no outrageous ambition in the second stage of awareness and demand of the labouring people in the world. It is but to demand that they take control of politics, military affairs and property, that they occupy the ruling position, and that those who labour with their minds and do no work be given the position of those who are ruled."(95)

The above two statements clearly indicate that Ch'en now viewed capitalism as the curse of society, and that the situation could only be transformed if the labouring people would capture the position of power. As for the labour movement in China, he declared at the end of his speech, that he believed that it had not even achieved the first stage of awareness. But he enjoined his audience to struggle, and not to forget that there would be a second stage to the movement.(96)

Also in this May Day commemorative number, Ch'en had collected together fifteen newspaper and magazine articles on the conditions of Hunanese women-workers in a Shanghai textiles factory.. The discussion in these articles revolved around the question whether the workers were benefiting from the capitalist mode of production.(97)

Ch'en gave his own opinion on the subject and freely acknowledged the influence of Marx on his own thinking. He argued that though the absolute wages of the workers might have been increased, this increase had been more than cancelled out by inflation and the workers' increased loss of surplus value to the capitalists, hence the standard of living of the workers had in fact declined.(98) He further rejected the argument that only private enterprise and capitalism could bring industrialisation and economic development to China, and made the plea that China must not follow "the wrong way of Europe, America and Japan", but that the capital concentration necessary for industrialisation could also be achieved by having the factories communally-owned and ploughing the profits back into production.(99)

It is worthwhile here to look at the other articles in the May Day commemorative number published in May 1920. This issue not only reflects the growing tendency towards socialism among the HCN intellectuals, but also more specifically casts light on Ch'en's thinking at the time, since he had by then resumed sole editorial responsibility for the magazine.

One of the main articles is Li Ta-chao's "A History of the 'May 1st' Movement", in which Li described the inception of May Day in 1884, and the subsequent spread of the idea and the demand for the eight-hour day in the context of the labour movements in the United States and France.(100) In his conclusion, Li said that he hoped that the May Day of 1920 would mark the day of awakening of his "labouring compatriots".

> Arise! Arise! Arise! Workers who toil and suffer! Today is the day of your awakening! (101)

There is another article on the May Day Movement in Paris in 1919, and there are also reports on the labour movements in Britain, Japan and the United States. But of the labour move-

ments abroad, most attention was devoted to the developments in Soviet Russia. There is a nineteen-page translation of the labour law of the U.S.S.R., and prominence was given to the fact that in the Soviet Union every able-bodied person must work, and that the government had organised extensive social security schemes for the citizens.(102) In another translated article, a Russian author gave a Marxist interpretation of the trade union movements in Western European countries, and put forward the Marxist conception of a trade union.(103) In a long appendix to this issue, HCN reprinted a translation of the Karakhan Proposal in which the new Soviet government offered to abrogate all the unequal treaties and privileges Czarist Russia had forced on China. There are also the reprints of the enthusiastic responses to the proposal from various sections of Chinese society and several periodicals.(104)

But taken as a whole, what is most interesting and striking about this May Day commemorative number is the great deal of attention that was given to the conditions of the Chinese workers. Over half of this issue is devoted to reports, many of which are very detailed and even illustrated with photographs, of the working and socio-economic conditions of industrial, handicraft, transport and domestic workers. Geographically, these reports cover the Shansi and Kiangsu provinces and the cities of Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Nanking and Changsha. The reports are all packed with a wealth of statistics relating to the workers' conditions.(105) Though most of them do not show any firm Marxist analysis, they indicate not only the first instance the HCN intellectuals involved themselves directly with the plight of the Chinese urban workers, but also how serious and positive was their interest in the ideas of socialism. Perhaps the spirit

of this issue could best be summarised by a description of the caligraphic inscriptions (t'i-tz'u 題詞) that decorate the pages. Of the sixteen inscriptions, only three were done by prominent figures (Wu Chih-hui, Tsai Yüan-p'ei and Sun Yat-sen), and the rest were by workers of various trades. The inscription from a tree-planting worker is typical, "Expel the Great Powers, Self-rule for all who labour." (106)

This May Day issue of HCN was published in May 1920, and as we will see in Section 11, it was at this time that the magazine came under the effective control of the first Chinese communists. By May, the stance of the magazine, as is described above, had already moved from its early New Culture ideology. But this change was not to be completed until the end of the year, and a few elements of New Culture ideology were still to be found in the magazine after this date. But what is important to note is that by May 1920, HCN was no longer vacilating from one Western doctrine to another, but was firmly set on its course to a commitment to Marxism. Apart from a brief interest in the ideas of Russell, which we will describe later, the movement towards a Marxist position developed rapidly in the course of the later months of 1920. Ch'en Tu-hsiu's conversion to Marxism was an important factor in this movement; it was later and more abrupt than that of Li Ta-chaos, but he embraced the Marxist ideology with the same fervour and faith that he had erlier displayed towards "Mr. Democracy" and "Mr. Science". An examination of Ch'en's writings in the later months of 1920 will show the extent of his conversion to Marxism.

In September 1920, Ch'en published his essay, "On politics". With his avoidance of the discussion of political matters long buried in the events of May Fourth, Ch'en now spoke of "the creation of a new politics on a social foundation", in order to get to "the true value of politics". (107) He no longer believed that cultural work should be the most important approach

to solving China's problems, but that the new intellectuals should participate in the social movement. Cultural work, to him, would only marginally touch on China's social and political problems, while these problems should in fact be tackled directly and at their roots. Furthermore, Ch'en asserted that brute force was not necessarily a bad thing.

> I think brute force is despicable when it is used by some people to protect the strong and the ruthless and to oppress the weak and the righteous. But if we change this around, and use brute force to save the weak and the righteous and to exterminate the strong and the ruthless, then it is not such a bad thing. (108)

Ch'en went on to describe that "the most unjust and painfull thing everywhere in the world" was that the idle and useless bourgeois minority used the state, politics, laws and other methods to suppress the hard-working and productive majority of those who did labour.

> If we want to eradicate this injustice and this suffering, the oppressed and productive labouring class must themselves create a new strength. They must occupy the positions of the state, and using politics, law and other means, thoroughly conquer the oppressing bourgeois class. ... If we do not advocate brute force, if we do not advocate the class struggle, if we do not capture the state, politics, and the law, if we merely have wild hopes for the appearance of a freely-organised society - then that group of bourgeoisie will still occupy everyday the positions of state, and everyday still make use of politics and the laws. If we have such fantasies about freedom, then even after ten thousand years, the oppressed labouring class will still have no opportunity of transforming themselves. (109)

Thus within less than a year, Ch'en's world-view had developed into Marxist one. He now saw China's problems as originating from the division into two antagonistic classes in her society. The bourgeoisie oppressed the proletariat, and the salvation of Chinese society, not just that of the proletariat, lay in the total triumph of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. To Ch'en, the basic ill of the country was no longer that of a particular Chinese disease that had been supposed to exist in

the minds of all his countrymen and that stopped them from emerging into the twentieth century. Now the capitalism of the bourgeoisie was the source of all evils, and its overthrow would be the starting point to the solution of China's problems. In this respect, Ch'en in the latter months of 1920 was close to Li Ta-chao's position in the "Problems & Isms" debate a year earlier. Ch'en wrote in October 1920 as follows.

> We should naturally think big when we want to transform society. We should naturally work towards a transformation of the system, only then will our effort not be wasted. But we must not imagine that once the system has been transformed, everything will be all right. However, we can say that as long as the system remains unchanged, a great deal of our effort is going to be wasted. (110)

Later, Ch'en further discussed this point more graphically.

> (Discussion of) isms and the system is similar to the relationship between sailing and its direction. In sailing, if we do not decide on the direction and merely put in blind effort, then we would not know if going forward we might hit rocks or whether we should go backward. ... I dare say that transforming society is just like sailing, we could not do away with either the direction of the effort. (111)

In an essay published in November 1920, Ch'en directly refuted the republicanism that he had so passionately advocated in the early years of HCN. He first argued that republican politics was undeniably valuable in the defeat of feudalism, but this value had been limited to Europe before the French Revolution and Asia before the Russian Revolution. Ch'en believed that for the oppressed majority, there was little difference between feudalism and capitalism, since both were designed for the happiness of a minority. (112)

> (In a republic) the education, public opinion, and electoral process of the whole country is in the hands of a minority of capitalists. In appearance it might look like republican politics, but in reality it is the politics of money. Therefore the majority do not really benefit from republican freedom and happiness. It is only socialist politics that advocates concrete happiness for the majority. ... Socialist politics will rise up to replace republican politics, just as

> republican politics has risen to replace the feudal system. By the principle of regeneration in which the new replaces the old, this is an inevitable development. (113)

Ch'en now also had a wider and different concept of democracy than the liberal variety he advocated earlier on. His new understanding of democracy also consisted of economic equality and economic justice. In November 1920, in a reply to a reader's letter, Ch'en indirectly attacked his own previous belief in bourgeois democracy and indicated how it had been superseded by his Marxist beliefs.

> At present, many people are using the slogans of "democracy" and "freedom" to oppose the dictatorship of the proletarian labouring class. I have two questions to put to them. (1) Before a revolution in the economic system, a great majority of the proletarian labourers are suffering and unfree. Is this part of "democracy"? (2) After a revolution in the economic system, every one who does labour will attain freedom. Is this against "democracy"? The wealthy people who will not have freedom, why don't they go and work? When there are no more wealthy people who refuse to work, and everyone in society is a labourer without property, is there still such a thing as a dictatorship ? (114)

Thus although Ch'en accepted Marxism later than Li Ta-chao, he was, by the end of 1920, no less committed to the ideology than Li. Indeed, while Li's attention was first drawn to Marxism via his interest in the act of the Russian Revolution and thus had to resolve by degree his own unorthodoxies, Ch'en, in the wake of the May Fourth events, embraced Marxism in toto more abruptly and without the initial doubts that Li had displayed. In a way, it could be said that Ch'en's conversion was due more to the influence of the historical circumstances of the time than a change in his own intellectual reasoning. We have looked at the increased political activism in the months following the May Fourth Incident, the disenchantment with the Western powers, and the concomitant interest in socialist ideas. Thus Ch'en may be regarded as more representative of the first

generation of Chinese Marxists than Li, and the above description of the change in his thinking casts light on the process in which HCN became a Marxist magazine in 1920. Of course, Ch'en's commitment to Marxism contributed to this development, but then Ch'en's own change was not an isolated and personal case, but was part of a leftward tendency in the post-May Fourth months.

At the same time, the May Fourth events affected the HCN intellectuals to varying degrees, and although there was undeniably a general leftward shift in HCN's ideology, this tendency was by no means uniform among the ranks of the HCN intellectuals. HCN's becoming a Marxist magazine was to mean a parting of ways among a group that had worked together for more than five years. Thus before we look at the actual concrete process by which HCN was to become a Marxist magazine, we willlook at the various divergent tendencies among the new intellectuals at this time.

10. The Disposition of Ideas in the 1920-21 Split.

In the latter months of 1921, as the editorial direction of HCN continued to shift leftward, and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, the editor, became more and more outspoken in his Marxist commitment, the ideas discussed in HCN were no longer the multitude of Western ideas which HCN had previously promoted. Instead, the discussion of socialist ideas, and in particular of Marxism, was displacing other ideas from the pages of the magazine. In addition, Ch'en was increasingly showing his impatience, if not hostility, towards his HCN colleagues who still pinned their hopes on Western democracy and science and who continued to shun polititical discusions.

In his essay, "On politics", published in the September issue of HCN, Ch'en made no bones about his feelings towards those who "refused to use revolutionary means to transform politics, law and the state."

> They do not advocate direct action, and they do not advocate doing away with the state, politics and law which the bourgeois class use to make evils. They still advocate parliamentarianism, and take up the approach of electoral struggle. They participate in (i.e. surrender to) the government and parliament which the bourgeois class use to make evils, and hope to use their politics and law to bring about socialist measures. The result is that not only they fail in their aim, but also they become one with the bourgeoisie, and even carry out measures that oppress the labouring class and oppose socialism. At present, the governments of Britain, France and Germany are all like this. This is like somebody who wants the skin of a tiger, but is instead not only bitten by the tiger but even helpsthe tiger to bite others. We should take this as a lesson and avoid it. (115, parenthesis in the original)

In another essay in the same issue of HCN, the only function Ch'en allowed the "democratic faction of the bourgeoisie" was that they were opposed to the monarchists. But Ch'en emphasised that once they triumphed over the monarchists, the bourgeois democrats would immediately become the enemy of socialists.(116) Later in November, in a postulation that foreshadowed his later supposed Trotskyist tendencies, Ch'en argued that the transition from feudalism to socialism in China would be quite short in time, and thus indirectly further downgraded the usefulness of the bourgeois democrats. Ch'en first stated that for China, as with all other societies, republicanism would replace feudalism, and republicanism would in turn be replaced by socialism. He then went on to say that in China feudalism had temporarily been restored and had displaced republicanism. But then, using the Russian Revolution as an example, he asserted that for Eastern countries, the period of time between feudalism and socialism would not necessarily have to be a long one as in Western Europe.(117)

Such ideas of Li Ta-chao and Ch'en Tu-hsiu were naturally unacceptable to the liberals on HCN as represented by Hu Shih. In between these two groups, there were those who were enthusiastic about socialist ideas in general and who did not, or could not differentiate between

the ideological subtleties of various socialist ideas. But it was the divergence between the liberal reformists and the Marxists that was the most apparent and historically the most important. The liberals were much less easily identifiable as a group than the Marxists. One reason for this was that they did not advocate liberalism systematically, or sometimes even consciously. The common ground for the liberals was that they in general adhered to the ideology and approach of the New Culture Movement, and were not disposed to engage in political activities. In this respect, the liberals on HCN were Hu Shih, Kao I-han and T'ao Li-kung. Although they shared in the general feeling of disenchantment with the Western powers in the post-May Fourth months, they were not as ready to partake in political activism, and were more attracted to Dewey's pragmatism than to the various socialist ideas. The liberals' pessimistic view of the Chinese political scene, with all its confusion and backwardness, led them to the conclusion that cultural and educational approaches would be more effective.

In August 1920, several liberal intellectuals, including Hu Shih, T'ao Meng-ho, Chiang Mon-lin 蔣夢麟 (a member of the Kuomintang) and Chang Wei-tz'u 張慰慈 (an associate of the HCN group who had written on American local government for the magazine) as well as, surprisingly, Li Ta-chao, published their "Manifesto for the Struggle of Freedom". This was essentially a petition to the Peking government for the abolition of the restrictive laws and regulations governing press and publishing that were imposed during the years of Yüan Shih-k'ai. At the same time, the liberals affirmed their belief in the freedom of speech, publication and association, and the principle of habeas corpus. Finally they demanded that fair and democratic elections be held, supervised by independent organisations. The tone of the Manifesto was set in its preamble which began by asserting that nine years of republicanism had not brought any improvements to the country, and that its political life had been no more than a struggle of power

between parties and factions. The Manifesto then went on to emphasise that the most important thing to do was to infuse the people with the spirit of democracy so that the republic could have genuine republican politics.

> When politics has taken us to such a dead end, we must awaken ourselves to the fact that genuine republicanism can only be brought about if politics is initiated by the people. This can only happen in an atmosphere where a genuine spirit of free thought and free criticism can grow.(118)

The political philosophy in this Manifesto, with its affirmation of democracy and civil rights, was still very close to the ideology of the New Culture Movement, in particular, the liberals' disenchantment with politics and disbelief in the efficacy of political action. It is in this respect that the liberals were to suffer their greatest weakness, for they did not put forward any definite ways by which their noble demands and goals could be brought about, except for the prospect that the country had to await a long and indefinite period of a spiritual transformation. This did not suit the mood of the time. Furthermore, the liberals and the Marxists differed basically in their conception of politics. When Li Ta-chao and Ch'en Tu-hsiu spoke of a "fundamental" or "political" solution, they were very far from the pragmatist position of Hu Shih who believed that society could only be reformed piecemeal and at a gradual pace.

It is thus not surprising that we find Ch'en Tu-hsiu criticising Hu Shih for his refusal to discuss politics. In his essay, "On politics", published in September 1920, Ch'en described Hu as representative of those "academics" who did not discuss politics because "they were put off by the phoney politics of power struggle". But then Ch'en went on to quote Hu himself to show that there was nothing positive in such a passive response to the political situation. The quotation from Hu which Ch'en quoted is as follows.

> We have always been unwilling to discuss concrete

> politics, but then concrete politics has come to bother us all the time. (119)

Ch'en commented somewhat sardonically that if such bother was to be got rid of, one just had to talk about politics.(120) Li Lung-mu, a modern Chinese Communist historian, dates the beginning of the split among the HCN intellectuals from the publication of the special issue on Marxism in May 1919.(121) While it is true that the propagation of socialist ideas could be described as having started at that time, Li's Marxist thinking at the time was but somewhat of an anomaly among his colleagues and did not bring about any visible friction to the ranks of HCN intellectuals. But as we have seen in the previous sections, the May Fourth Incident brought with it several important changes and it was the different responses of the liberals and Marxists to these changes that really formed the basis of the split that was to come. In the later months of 1920, the divergence between the reformists and the radicals became more pronounced, and in the ensuing battle of words, the liberals increasingly found themselves on the defensive. Not only were the Marxists helped by the fact that Ch'en Tu-hsiu was the editor of the magazine, but also the intellectual and political atmosphere of the months after May Fourth made it increasingly necessary for the liberals to defend their programme of gradual reform.

In the larger circle of the new intellectuals, some members of the Kuomintang took up a position midway between the polarisation of the liberals and the Marxists. Sun Yat-sen and Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei were both influential figures at that time, and their position was close to that of democratic socialism. The KMT organ, Construction (Chien-she 建設), was founded in June 1919 and edited by Tai Chi-t'ao 戴季陶. It published both articles on Western democratic ideas as well as various socialist ideas. However, the discussions of Marxism by Tai Chi-t'ao and Hu Han-min were made very much from the nationalistic viewpoint,

For example, on the question of the equal distribution of wealth and common ownership, Hu Han-min suggested that such a principle had long been evident in the ancient "well-field" system. More significantly, the Kuomintang intellectuals did not accept the creative function of the class struggle, but suggested instead that society should take preventive action against excessive class struggle.(122) In another respect, however, Sun Yat-sen was closer to the Marxists than the liberals in his advocacy that the problems of China could only be solved after the ambitious militarists, bureaucrats and corrupt politicians had all been swept away.(123)

As for the Progressive Party, a large part of its membership was associated with established politicians and bureaucrats. But its more progressive members, notably Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Chang Tung-sun 張東蓀 were at the time under the influence of Russell and the ideas of guild socialism. They argued that the greatest threat to China was foreign capitalism, and suggested that native Chinese capitalism and cooperativism should be promoted to counter foreign capitalists. They believed that this would be the surest way of providing China with an efficient economic structure, since the Chinese workers were as yet too few and too weak to run either the state or the economy.(124) Some of the ideas of the Chinese guild socialists were inspired by Russell and it is appropriate at this point to look at the extent of Russell's influence in the post-May Fourth months.

Russell was invited to visit China by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and others. Following a visit to Soviet Russia, he arrived in China in October 1920 and stayed for just under a year. During his stay, he delivered many lectures and his writings were translated and discussed in a number of the new periodicals. In many ways, the visits of Russell

and Dewey were quite similar: both were prominant figures from the West who were invited to China by their followers in the hope that they would help to find a solution to China's problems. Both men gave their comments on the Chinese situation, and both generated a subsequent debate among the Chinese new intellectuals.

Russell considered that the most important thing for China was to build up her industry and education. But to do this, she must first establish a strong and efficient government, and he suggested that such a government should be parliamentary in form and consisting of those who believed in the republican constitution.(125) As to the mode of economic development that China should follow, he was somewhat ambiguous. At the time, he had already published his critical impressions of his recent visit to the Soviet Union(126), and he advised China to adopt, with important modifications, what Lenin had called "state capitalism". The reason for this, Russell argued, was less to establish the Soviet type of socialism which he criticised as excessively bureaucratic and dictatorial, than to generate rapid industrialisation.(127) But the "state capitalism" which he advocated was far from that of Lenin. Since Russell felt that the Chinese proletariat was far from developed and the Chinese government was too corrupt and incompetent, the initiative for industrialisation would have to come from native capitalists.(128) On this point, a follower of Russell summarised his ideas as follows.

> Therefore, we must go through the capitalists. In the world today there is no way of avoiding this stage in the movement towards socialism. If Russia had not passed through the capitalist stage, it would have been difficult for her to succeed. If China wants to realise socialism, it has to promote capitalism.(129)

Russell's view of what Chinese education should be like must also have been surprising to the new intellectuals. Although he believed that the Chinese should learn Western science and technology,

he maintained that the Chinese conception of life was superior to the Western one, which he criticised as too materialistic and aggressive. On this point, he was close to those conservative elements in Chinese society who had been arguing for the preservation of the "national quintessence". He emphasised that the Chinese should preserve "the urbanity and courtesy, the candour and the pacific temper, which are characteristic of the Chinese nation".(130)

The course and extent of Russell's influence in China can be indirectly gauged by HCN's coverage of his ideas. Before his arrival in October 1920, HCN had published his views on the population question and discussed his social philosophy.(131) At the time of his arrival in China, HCN published a number of his writings in its October and November issues, no doubt initially encouraged by his well-known pro-socialist reputation and hostility towards the Allies' role in the First World War.(132) But as his views on the Chinese situation became known, they were quickly utilised by the conservative elements to oppose the new intellectuals, so coverage of Russell in HCN became critical. Ch'en Tu-hsiu wrote a short satirical piece on the attempt by Shanghai's merchants and industrialists to identify themselves with the ideas of Russell.(133) At the same time, HCN also began to publish the Russian reactions to his critical view of the Soviet Union.(134) After December 1920 discussion of Russell ceased altogether.

This crystallisation of various ideas was perhaps an inevitable consequence of the very success of the New Culture Movement and the May Fourth protest. In the years before May Fourth, the common enemy of the new intellectuals was easily identifiable, as being all those who represented the conservative aspects of Chinese society. HCN in those years was a good example of the collaborative effort of the new intellectuals to bring about a cultural transformation of

their countrymen. The May Fourth protests testified to the effect of their work, and yet at the same time demonstrated to some of the new intellectuals that the cultural approach was not necessarily the most effective lever in moving Chinese society. The year 1919 was a milestone in another respect. The events of that year demonstrated to the new intellectuals that it was possible to change Chinese society rapidly, and so the question arose as to what road Chinese society should take. It was on this point that the new intellectuals differed. It was one question to promote various Western ideas as a means of attacking the conservative aspects of Chinese society, but quite another to determine which of these ideas were to be put in practice at a time when the citadel of conservatism was crumbling and one had to decide what kind of building one was going to put up in its place. In both the history of modern China and the history of HCN, the most important group that went in for the design of a new China was the Marxist group that was led by Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao. We will now look at the origins of the Chinese Communist movement, and how HCN was related to it.

11. HCN & the Origins of the Chinese Communist Movement.

The First Congress of the Chinese Communist Party was held in July 1921, a date now officially celebrated as the birth of the party. But communist activities in China preceded this date, and it is such activities that we will look at in this section.

In the atmosphere of political activism after the May Fourth Incident, many new intellectuals and students, including those who were to be the first members of the Chinese Communist Party, did not confine themselves solely to organising protest over the proposed settlement in Versailles. Many politically-oriented groups were organised and a multitude of new periodicals appeared on the scene. From the

time of the workers' strike in Shanghai in June 1919, a link was established between the workers and some of the left-wing students, which spread to the other main cities and was to be the basis of early communist activities.

Led by Teng Chung-hsia and Chang Kuo-t'ao, members of the Marxist Research Society which Li Ta-chao organised in November 1918, began organisational acivities among Peking's working class in the spring of 1919. The centre of their activities was around Chang-hsin-tien 長辛店, a railway junction outside Peking, and their work later led to the formation of the Peking-Hankow Railway Workers' Union, one of the first communist unions in China. According to a Russian source quoted by Meisner, Li and his students were at the time acquainted with two members of the Russian Communist Party who found themselves in north China by chance as a result of the civil war in Siberia; these two Russians acquainted the Chinese students with Lenin's "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", and advised them on the necessity of agitational work among the working class. As a result, organisational work among the dock-workers in Tientsin was in progress by early 1920.(135) This group of Marxist-oriented students and a similar group in Shanghai were the first embryonic communist groups in China.

As mentioned earlier on, Ch'en moved from Peking to Shanghai early in 1920 and at the same time resumed sole editorial responsibility for HCN. In Shanghai, Ch'en was quickly in the centre of the city's radical intellectual activities, surrounding himself with the followers of Sun Yat-sen, anarchists and socialists of every description.(136) At the time, he was as yet unacquainted with the Leninist notion of a dedicated and tightly-knit revolutionary vanguard, but believed that "what China urgently required are men of learning with a conscience in order to create genuine happiness for the majority of people in society".(137)

In Peking, the Marxist Research Society founded by Li in November 1918 was superseded in December 1919 by the Society for the Study of Socialism which we have noted in Section 8. In March 1920, Li Ta-chao and his student followers broke away from this broadly-based Society, and organised the Society for the Study of Marxist Theory (Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i yen-chiu-hui 馬克思主義研究會). In the same month, the Comintern agent, Gregori Voitinsky, arrived in China and discussed with Li Ta-chao the idea of the formation of a Chinese Communist party. Li was in agreement with such an idea but suggested that Voitinsky should further discuss the matter with Ch'en Tu-hsiu.(138) Thereupon, Voitinsky departed for Shanghai where he also won Ch'en's agreement, and a small Communist group of seven was organised in May 1920.(139) A further meeting was held in Shanghai, attended by Ch'en, Li and other Marxist intellectuals, at which the idea of a national party was discussed. It was agreed that Li would be responsible for the organisational work in the northern provinces and Ch'en for the southern provinces. This is the origin of the slogan, "Nan-Ch'en, Pei-Li" (南陳北李, Ch'on in the south, Li in the north), in the early years of the Chinese Communist movement .(140)

Chow Tse-tsung further suggests that when Voitinsky was in Shanghai, Ch'en also put the idea of forming a Communist party to such non-Marxist intellectuals as Tai Chi-t'ao and Chang Tung-sun (the guild socialist). They reached initial agreement on the idea, but when the class nature of the party was brought up for discussion, some of the participants, including Chang Tung-sun felt obliged to withdraw.(141)

It seems that after Ch'en had organised the Shanghai Communist group in May 1920, HCN quickly came under its effective control.(142) This was exercised in the following way: at the same time as the

formation of the Communist group in Shanghai, Ch'en also organised a New Youth Society in the city, as distinct from the New Youth Society that Ch'en and others had formed in Peking in September 1919. It was located in The French Concession in Shanghai, but the same address was in fact used by the newly-founded Communist group for their organisational work among the working class.(143) The issue of HCN published that month was the special May Day commemorative number. The next issue of the magazine, Volume 8 Number 1, was published in September 1920 and it carried the following announcement.

> From Volume 8 Number 1 of this magazine, we in the editorial department have organised the New Youth Society which will be directly responsible for all the work relating to editing, printing and distribution. ....The Public Welfare Bookshop (which had published the magazine since its first issue in September 1915) will be responsible for all matters relating to the issues before Volume 8 Number 1.(144, my parenthesis)

The inside of the back-cover of this issue further stated that "the Editorial Department of the New Youth Society" was in charge of editing, and that the magazine was printed by "the Society's Printing Bureau" and distributed by the Society itself.(145) It seems that HCN's distribution did not suffer as a result of this change-over. A list published in the magazine in November 1920 listed ninety bookshops in the country that sold the magazine, as compared with eighty bookshops in a similar list published in January 1920.(146) As for the printing, one source suggests that the printing shop was obtained with the financial assistance of Voitinsky and that it also did printing jobs for various other political groups.(147)

After its establishment, the Shanghai Communist group was soon engaged in agitational work among the workers. A workers' school was founded, and unions were soon organised among engineering, printing and textile workers.(148) The newly-founded New Youth Society was closely connected with this work of the Shanghai Communist group since in fact membership of the two overlapped. For example,

the group started a magazine, World of Labour (Lao-tung chieh 勞動界), in August 1920, and not only was the magazine distributed by the Society but also its contributors, such as Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Ch'en Wang-tao 陳望道 and Chang Kuo-t'ao were all members of the Society. Through World of Labour, the Shanghai Communists encouraged the formation of Communist trade unions which in turn invited them to become their "honorary members".(149) One source suggests that an interim Central Committee of the Party was founded in September 1920, and that HCN then became the "unofficial organ of the Central Committee". This source further suggests that HCN then became part of the propaganda work for the Central Committee in its preparation for the First Congress in the following year. Prior to the founding of the Party in July 1921, HCN carried over one hundred and thirty reports on the labour movements and conditions in various parts of the country.(150)

It seems that during the first month of the Shanghai Communist group, its members were working simultaneously on two fronts. As members of the group, they were engaged in agitational work among the workers, and this work was supplemented by their publication activities which were conducted through the New Youth Society. In October 1920, the Shanghai Marxists helped to organise the Industrial and Commercial Friendship Society (Kung-shang yu-i hui 工商友誼會), consisting largely of shop-assistants. Again, the Society's magazine, Work-mate (Huo-yu 伙友) was published by the New Youth Society.(151) At the same time, the New Youth Society began to publish translations of Western works on socialism. Two of the first to be brought out were Kirkup's History of Socialism and G.D.H. Cole's Self-Government in Industry. In later years, the Society was to become an important publisher of the translations of the writings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin.(152)

The Peking Communist group, under Li Ta-chao, was doing similar work. Its members included such future Communist notables as Teng Chung-hsia and Chang Kuo-t'ao, and, according to the biographer of Mao's early political life, Mao Tse-tung in Hunan was also in close contact with Li, folowing their meeting in Peking in February 1920. (153) On May Day 1920, the workers of Chang-hsin-tien held a demonstration, after which they organised a Workers' Club (Kung-jen chü-le-pu 工人俱樂部) A workers' evening school was also founded, and the group also started a magazine, Labour Clarion (Lao-tung yin 勞動音).(154)

In the latter part of 1920, following the founding of the Shanghai and Peking Communist groups, similar groups using a variety of names were organised in Wuhan, Changsha, Hangchow and Tsinan.(155) In Hunan, Mao organised a Society for the Study of Marxism in September 1920, and a Socialist Youth Corps (She-hui chu-i ch'ing-nien t'uan 社會主義青年團) in October. Most of the members of these two groups came from the New People's Study Society which Mao had organised earlier in the May Fourth period.(156) According to his own account as related to Edgar Snow, Mao began to do organisational work among the workers from the winter of 1920.(157) Indeed, many of the future leaders of the Chinese Communist movement began their revolutionary Marxist careers at this time. Tung Pi-wu was in the Wuhan group. Abroad, the Young China Communist Party (Shao-nien Chung-kuo kung-ch'an-tang 少年中國共產黨) was founded in Paris in early 1921, and included in its membership Chou En-lai, Ts'ai Ho-sen 蔡和森, Li Li-san 李立三 , Chen Yi 陳毅, and Li Fu-ch'un 李富春 . In Germany, Chu Teh was in a Communist group formed among the Chinese students there, while Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai 瞿秋白 was in the group formed in Tokyo.(158)

In November 1920, the Shanghai Communist group founded the magazine, "The Communist"(Kung-ch'an tang 共產黨). This

came out irregulary and was later published in Canton. It published translations of the writings of Marx and Lenin, and carried reports on the Soviet Union and the Communist movements in various parts of the world. It emphasised that China was a class society and that it should follow the Russian example and undergo a Communist revolution led by the urban workers(159) The magazine came out for only six issues, and its influence was limited by the fact that is was a somewhat clandestine publication.(160)

At about the same time as the founding of "The Communist", Sun Yat-sen was invited by the warlord, Ch'en Chiung-ming 陳炯明, to be the political leader of Kwangtung Province. Sun then invited Ch'en to take charge of the province's education system, and Ch'en subsequently moved to Canton in December 1920. The editorship of HCN was temporarily left in the hands of Ch'en Wang-tao, a member of the Shanghai Communist group and a dedicated Marxist.(161) In Canton, Ch'en helped to organise another Communist group which included Ch'en Kung-po and T'an P'ing-shan in its membership.(162) This group, like the Peking and Shanghai groups, also organised a workers' school and established the magazine, The Labourer (Lao-tung che 勞動者).(163)

Thus the year 1920 may be described as the period of gestation for the birth of the Chinese Communist Party in July 1921. The idea for the formation of a national party was discussed and agreed upon, and several local Communist groups were set up towards this end, and began to undertake organisational and educational work among the workers. At the same time, both Li and Ch'en were as yet unacquainted with the Leninist notion of the revolutionary vanguard, and accepted non-Marxists to the membership of some of these groups. For instance, some of the members of Li's Peking group were anarchists(164), and so were some of the members of Ch'en's Shanghai group(165). This inclusion of non-Marxists in the membership of the local groups perhaps accounted for the subsequent change in editorial direction of the magazines set up by the groups. Of the four magazines set up, only the Labour Clarion

in Peking maintained its initial Marxist course. World of Labour in Shanghai later shunned political issues and concentrated merely on the improvement of the conditions of the workers(166), while the group's other magazine, Work-Mate later came under the control of the Kuomintang.(167) As for the magazine of the Canton group, The Labourer, it later came under the control of the anarchists.(168)

However, these developments should not detract from the importance of the work of these early Communist groups. The work carried out by these groups was the first real link between the Chinese Marxist intellectuals and the working class, and laid the foundation for the formation of the party in 1921. This fact is acknowledged by Chinese historians of today. For instance, Li Lung-mu, while criticising the "opportunism" of World of Labour, nevertheless acknowledges the magazine's achievement in not only "having roughly spread the truth of Marxism" in this early period, but also in assisting the workers to form their own unions.(169)

As for HCN, perhaps due to its undeniable influence and importance, it was to remain in the control of the communists until it ceased publication in July 1926. From the time the Shanghai Communist group, under Ch'en Tu-hsiu, gained effective control of the magazine in May 1920, HCN began to serve the cause of the Communist movement. We have already looked at the May Day commemorative number published in that month. In the following issue, reports on the new developments in Soviet Russia became a regular feature of the magazine, and were carried in a new column "Studies of Soviet Russia" (O-lo-ssu yen-chiu 俄羅斯研究). This column largely consisted of translations, mostly by Yüan Chen-ying 袁振英 , of Russian, Western and Japanese reports on the socialist construction taking place in Russia. In the following issues, this column carried articles on various aspects of Russian life such as the labour movement, marriage laws, education and other measures of the Soviet government. By way of contrast,

the "Social Investigation" column in the magazine reported on the conditions in Chinese society. For example, in the same issue in which "Studies of Soviet Russia" first appeared, this column described the ancient customs in Hunan and Hupeh, and the conditions of the Hankow coolies and the Wuchang workers.(170)

It must be pointed out that after HCN came under the control of the Shanghai Communists, it did not undergo a complete facelift to the exclusion of all non-Marxist ideas. There were several reasons for this. Firstly, although the magazine was now edited by Ch'en in Shanghai, he still maintained his relations with his colleagues in Peking. Secondly, there were the various manuscripts that had either been written before the change or were in the middle of serialisation, both of which Ch'en published out of editorial courtesy. Thirdly, and perhaps the most important reason of all, Ch'en did not as yet comprehend the function of a revolutionary party or its publication. Finally, perhaps the pace of the change-over was a deliberate decision so that its influence would be more subtle and hence hopefully more effective.

As HCN became more and more overtly an instrument of the Marxists, remnants of the New Culture Movement lingered on in its pages till early 1921. The last of the transcription of Dewey's speeches was carried in September 1920, and the same issue also carried the second last of Hu Shih's essays for HCN, in which Hu discussed the teaching of Chinese literature in secondary schools.(171) Apart from the sporadic appearance of his vernacular poems, Hu Shih's last essay for HCN, on the subject of research methods for the study of vernacular grammar, appeared in July 1921(172). The two issues published in October and November 1920 showed a brief interest in the ideas of Russell, which we looked at in the last section. This interest was the last non-Marxist tendency in HCN's ideology and was quickly rejected.

As articles relating to what HCN had formerly stood for disappeared from its pages, so the magazine carried more and more articles on Marxist ideas and on the labour movements at home and abroad. The October 1920 issue carried a translation by Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸 of Maxim Gorky's idea of the function of literature in Russia at the time. Cheng believed that what the Soviet government was doing in the field of education was "a great and unprecedented plan to educate all its citizens", and that the Bolsheviks were not "the saboteurs of civilisation" as they had been accused, but its "protectors" and "creators".(173) In the following issue in November, there were the first of many translations by Yüan Chen-ying from Soviet Russia (a pro-Soviet weekly published in New York), as well as his translation of Lenin's report to the 8th Congress of the CPSU.(174) Lenin's "Politics and Economics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" was also translated in the next issue.

The extent of the Marxists' control of HCN by the end of 1920 can be indicated by the manner in which the last issue of that year was edited. The "Studies of Soviet Russia" column took nearly forty pages, but the most prominent part of this issue was "A discussion concerning socialism", which consisted of a number of articles which Ch'en Tu-hsiu had collected together and which he used in his debate with the guild socialists. At the time, the guild socialists were suggesting that although they would not defend capitalism as the ultimate goal, they believed that it was the most efficient way by which China would achieve economic development.(175) Chang Tung-sun, the most outspoken of the guild socialists, suggested that China should closely follow Russell's "advice": that China should first concentrate on developing her education and industry, even if by capitalist means.(176) Ch'en Tu-hsiu refuted this argument, and reproduced a letter he wrote to Russell at the time.

> In my opinion, although capitalism has been able to develop education and industry in Europe, America and Japan, at the same time it has turned them into societies that are avaricious, deceitful, expolitative and lacking in conscience. Furthermore, the great wars in the past and the great economic revolution in the future are both the consequences of capitalism. Everybody is aware of this fact. China is fortunate in that she can now use socialism to develop her education and industry. Capitalism has yet to take root in China, and so she can avoid taking the wrong way of Europe, America and Japan.(177)

Ch'en further reproduced a long letter which he wrote to Chang Tung-sun. In it he argued that Chinese capitalism was, and would continue to be, the agent of foreign capitalism - the source of China's troubles. Ch'en therefore argued that only a proletarian government would bring genuine development and improvement to Chinese society, and that the Russian Revolution had demonstrated that it was possible to progress rapidly from feudalism to socialism.(178)

Ch'en's editing of "A discussion concerning socialism" not only indicates the extent of his Marxist commitment, but also shows how HCN was being utilised for the Communist cause. This debate with the guild socialists was the first occasion in which the editorial direction of the magazine was systematically pointed against non-Marxist ideas in the community of the new intellectuals. Formerly the magazine was preoccupied with attacking the conservatives, with at most the occasional jibes by individual writers against other new intellectuals. For example, in the "Problems & Isms" debate in the summer of 1919, HCN was more a venue of debate than an instrument of a particular side. In later years, the magazine was to be an instrument of the Communists in their debate against non-Marxist ideologies.

This debate with the guild socialists also indicates how far HCN had moved from the position of the liberals and the reformists on the magazine. The basic position of the latter at this time was still that China could follow a long-term programme of gradual

reforms and education. To them, HCN was now not only preoccupied with political discussions which they believed to be inappropriate, but also propounding a political philosophy and world-view that was obviously opposed to their own. The situation was becoming intolerable for them, and an open split was inevitable, This occured at the end of 1920, and this is what we shall look at next.

12. The Liberals' Departure from HCN.

The final events leading up to the split between the reformists and radicals on HCN are very well chronicled in an exchange of letters in the winter of 1920-21 between Ch'en and his colleagues in Peking. These letters will be examined in some details in this section as they not only record how the decision for the split came about, but also throw light on the working relationships between the HCN intellectuals and how each of them viewed the magazine.

On December 16th, the day he was departing for Kwangtung to take up Sun Yat-sen's invitation to be the commissioner of the province's education, Ch'en wrote to Hu Shih and Kao I-han in Peking and informed them of his departure from Shanghai. He added that he would be leaving the editorial responsibility for the HCN to Ch'en Wang-tao (a member of the Shanghai Communist group and the first to make a complete translation of the Communist Manifesto). Then, in an apparent reply to a criticism that HCN had become too political, Ch'en agreed that he also thought that "the colours of HCN are too bright", and added that Ch'en Wang-tao also believed that its contents should be "slightly changed to put the emphasis henceforth on philosophy and literature". If this was to be so, Ch'en went on, his colleagues

in Peking had to contribute more articles. Ch'en believed that "an important reason" for the "slight difference in contents in the last few numbers" was that those in Peking had submitted too few articles.(179)

Hu did not receive Ch'en's letter until the 27th of December, and early in January sent his reply. As the contents of this letter formed the basis of discussion in the subsequent correspondence, it is translated here in full, apart from the opening paragraph in which Hu acknowledged receipt of Ch'en's first letter.

> You said in your letter that "recently you also think" that "the colours of HCN are too bright", but this has by now become a fact. Although there is now the intention to tone down its colours, this won't be such an easy matter. The skill of those in Peking in toning down its colours cannot possibly keep up with the lightning-quick methods of those in Shanghai in brightening up the colours. I think there are now only three ways open to us:
>
> 1. We can let HCN turn into a magazine that has a special kind of colouring, and at the same time start another magazine that deals with philosophy and literature. It does not need to have many pages, but its materials must be excellent. I have such an intention since autumn, but because I was ill, I could not make plans and did not tell my friends.
>
> 2. If we want to "change the contents" of HCN, it is imperative that we should resume our agreement "not to discuss politics". But now it seems that those in Shanghai would not be able to take this step, and I think you would be even more unable to do this since you would not want to display weakness. But those in Peking would not be unable to make such a declaration. Therefore I suggest that we make use of the opportunity of your departure from Shanghai and transfer the editorial matters of HCN, from Volume 9 Number 1 onwards, back to Peking. Then those in Peking will publish a Manifesto in Volume 9 Number 1, based roughly on the Manifesto in Volume 7 Number 1, and declare specifically that we willnot discuss politics but will concentrate on the reformation of learning, thought, arts and literature.
>
> 3. Meng-ho suggested that, since the post office has refused to deal with the HCN, we might as well stop publishing it. This is the third

> way. But this would interfere with the work of the New Youth Society, and so it is not as good as the first two ways.
>
> All in all, this matter needs to be settled. I hope that you will give me a frank and direct answer, and I hope that you will forgive me for speaking frankly and directly.
>
> I-han (Kao I-han) and Wei-tz'u (Chang Wei-tz'u) have read this letter, and Shou-ch'ang (Li Ta-chao), Meng-ho (T'ao Meng-ho), and Hsüng-t'ung (Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung) know of its contents. They all agree with the first two ways and think that they are both practicable. I shall inform the rest of the people tomorrow.
>
> Shih (Hu Shih)
>
> Fu-wu (Wang Hsing-kung) has read this letter, and expressed his "profound agreement". Shih
> I shall make a copy of this letter and send it to the Shanghai editorial department. Shih.(180)

Ch'en's reply to the above letter is not available today, but it is referred to in Hu Shih's next letter to those in Peking. According to Hu, Ch'en "misunderstood" many points in Hu's letter to him. One such misunderstanding was that Ch'en thought Hu's first suggestion, that of starting another magazine, was against him personally and "has nothing to do with HCN". Hu further described Ch'en as "very annoyed" over Hu's suggestion that HCN should be transferred back to Peking and a declaration be made that it would not discuss politics.(181)

Hu's reply to this second letter from Ch'en was also addressed to those who were in Peking (Li Ta-chao, Lu Hsün, Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung, T'ao Meng-ho, Chang Wei-tz'u, Chou Tso-jen, Wang Hsing-kung and Kao I-han). In this letter, Hu first rejected the third idea in his previous letter, that is, of stopping altogether the publication of HCN. On the first suggestion or starting another magazine, Hu said that Ch'en had misunderstood him on this point, and that Hu was neither against him nor HCN when he put forward this suggestion.

> It is just that I feel there is a need today for a magazine that is concerned with literature and philosophy. At present, HCN has virtually become a Chinese translation of Soviet Russia. This is why I want to start a magazine that concentrates on learning, arts and literature. Since Tu-hsiu

> is now so angry and thinks that (this suggestion) is designed against him, I am willing to withdraw this suggestion.(182)

This left only the second suggestion in Hu's previous letter, which was to move the magazine back to Peking and to declare that it would not discuss politics. On the point of not discussing politics, Hu described Ch'en, in the latter's second letter to him, as being "very annoyed" at such a proposal. Moreover, Hu said that Lu Hsün and Chou Tso-jen had both expressed the opinion that it would not be necessary to make a declaration that the magazine would not discuss politics. Therefore, Hu now said that he was also willing to withdraw his proposal of "making a declaration not to discuss politics", but to discuss only the point about moving the magazine back to Peking.

> My reasons for moving the magazine back to Peking are as follows. If the HCN is edited in Peking, then perhaps those in Peking can be pressed more often to contribute articles. When Tu-hsiu was in Shanghai, it was not easy for him to make sure that the articles were forthcoming. This situation has now further deteriorated with HCN in the hands of someone who is a stranger to us (i.e. Ch'en Wang-tao). The present situation is opposed to Tu-hsiu's wish before he left for Canton that "Those in Peking must contribute more articles."...We should not consider starting another magazine until we have resolved this question (of whether to move HCN to Peking). Otherwise, it might seem, both in appearance and reality, that we are opposed to Tu-hsiu. People on the outside would certainly have such an impression. Frankly speaking, I do not think that we can in fact run two magazines. Although Tu-hsiu said that "this (whether to start a new magazine) has nothing to do with HCN", is this really so? If a majority of the editorial staff members in Peking, Shanghai and Canton decide to transfer editorial matters back to Peking, then we can be more sure of "changing the contents" and "concentrating on philosophy and literature" (both phrases in Tu-hsiu's letter) (parentheses in the original). Then we will not need to start another fire (i.e. magazine) and bring upon ourselves disunity and other people's criticism and ridicule. (183, my parentheses)

At the end of his letter, Hu asked those in Peking to express their individual opinions on his proposal, and their various comments were collected together by Hu Shih for the perusal of both Ch'en Tu-hsiu and those in Peking. The various comments of the HCN intellectuals on Hu Shih's proposal of returning the magazine to Peking are as follows.(184) Ch'en noted that Chang Wei-tz'u and Kao I-han agreed to this proposal.

T'ao Meng-ho:

I support the proposal of moving HCN back to Peking. If this is not possible, then we should stop publishing the magazine. In no circumstances should we have two magazines, since this would destroy the unity in the spirit of HCN.

Wang Hsing-kung:

I am in agreement with the opinion of Meng-ho.

Li Ta-chao:

I still support the previous first proposal (i.e. leaving HCN as it is, and starting a new magazine). At the same time, I would not oppose the suggestion to move the editing back to Peking if this would not "destroy the unity in the spirit of HCN". I am totally against a stop in publication for HCN, since this would be even worse than a split .

Note by Hu Shih: Later Shou-ch'ang (Li Ta-chao) withdrew his first suggestion, and has given his support to the idea of editing the magazine in Peking.

Chou Tso-jen:

I support the proposal of editing the magazine in Peking. But as I see it, the present tendency in HCN is towards a split, and it would not be easy to bring about a compromise or unity. Whether we use the first or second proposal, the result would still be the same, and so we might as well let the split happen. The first proposal might just be a little bit better.

Lu Hsün:

My opinion is the same as that of Tso-jen, though I don't think we need to fight over the name of HCN.

Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung:

My opinion is similar to that of the Chou brothers (Lu Hsün and Chou Tso-jen), and feel that we should split into two magazines. ..... Meng-ho suggests that we should stop publication. I, like Shou-ch'ang (Li Ta-chao) am totally against this. I believe that our friendship towards Chung-fu (Ch'en Tu-hsiu) is just as it has always been, and has not been damaged one little bit. The organisation of HCN has been voluntarily formed, and so if we have any difference in opinions among ourselves, we should only follow the method of "vacating one's seat" and should not raise the suggestion that the organisation should be disbanded. To take this to the extreme: even if we had terminated our friendship with Chung-fu and had nothing but extremely bad feelings towards him, and at the same time he

> was the only one who wanted to continue to publish HCN - we still should not ask him to stop publishing.

Thus at the end of January, the disposition of opinions on the future of HCN stood as follows. Ch'en Tu-hsiu wanted the HCN to be edited in Shanghai by Ch'en Wang-tao, and that there would be no declaration that the magazine would not discuss politics. Hu Shih, Chang Wei-ts'u and Kao I-han conceded the latter point to Ch'en, but insisted that the magazine should be edited in Peking. These three were in turn supported by T'ao Meng-ho and Wang Hsing-kung (who both believed that if the magazine could not be moved to Peking, then it should cease publication altogether) and by Li Ta-chao who supported the move to Peking provided that such an action would not "destroy the unity in the spirit of HCN". Finally, the idea of starting another magazine was supported by Chou Tso-jen, Lu Hsün and Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung.

Towards the end of January, the dispute was suddenly and unwittingly resolved by the course of events. At the instigation of the Shanghai authorities, the French Concession police raided the editorial office of the magazine and seized the plates for Volume 8 Number 6 which was due to be published on February 1. Subsequently the editorial office of HCN was moved to Canton, where Volume 8 Number 6 was published on April 1, two months later than its intended date. In Volume 9 Number 1, the column "Notes from the Editorial Office" carried the following announcement.

> When the layout for volume 8 number 1 was nearly completed, all the manuscripts were seized by ruffians (the French Concession police) who also forbade the printing of the magazine in Shanghai. This Society (New Youth Society) had to look for the manuscripts to edit them all over again. We also had to move our place of printing to Kwangtung. This is why we could not come out on time. We apologise to those readers who took the trouble to write to us several times, enquiring after the cause of the delay. Perhaps China should also apologise to us. (185)

On February 15, just after the police raid, Ch'en wrote to Hu Shih.

> I have received your letter of the 6th (February). At the time I did not agree that HCN should move to Peking, because, frankly speaking, the atmosphere in the University has not been too good lately. Now that HCN has been banned, we have to move to Canton, and the question of whether it should go to Peking does not arise anymore. I wholeheartedly agree that you (those in Peking) should start another magazine. There are too few good magazines in China, and whatever you people do cannot be bad. But I don't think I will have the time to help with the articles. Moreover, since it is to be published in Peking, I think it will not be so easy for me to write articles, since for the time being I cannot even return to Shanghai. You advised me that I should not suspect my friends so much; I agree that this is a piece of advice that I should constantly bear in mind. It's just that I always worry about my scholarly friends in their ivory towers, lest they might be made use of by the politicians.(186)

In retrospect, one could say that even had the manuscripts not been seized and Hu Shih and the others had continued to insist on returning HCN to Peking, it would be unlikely that Ch'en Tu-hsiu would have relinquished the Marxists' control of HCN. Not only had Ch'en himself founded the magazine in September 1915, but he had also resumed sole control of the magazine from early 1920. Furthermore, in Section 9 we have seen that Ch'en was increasingly critical and impatient with the "democratic faction of the bourgeoisie."

This dispute also demonstrates two developments. The first is that Hu Shih was beginning to assume a position of leadership among the liberals. During the dispute, Hu had taken it upon himself to mobilise support for the return of HCN to Peking. In May 1922, Hu Shih, Kao I-han and T'ao Li-kung indeed started another magazine, Endeavor Weekly (Nu-li chou-pao 努力週報) which advocated liberalism, democracy and pragmatism. (We shall be looking more closely at this magazine in Chapter 5.) The second thing that this dispute demonstrates is that the intellectuals on HCN, despite their ideological differences, remained close friends. Some of the words

and phrases used in the exchange of letters might seem harsh and strong, but they were used in a context of friendly criticism and frank discussion, and at most of forthrightness. In a way, all parties in the dispute realised that such a dispute would be inevitable after the change in editorial direction of HCN. When the dispute did arise, all parties, with perhaps the exception of Ch'en Tu-hsui, made a genuine attempt to arrive at some sort of compromise in order to avoid a parting of ways.

This reluctance on the part of the HCN intellectuals to see an open split is illustrated by Li Ta-chao's somewhat surprising support for the proposal of moving HCN back to Peking, provided that such a move would not "destroy the unity in the spirit of HCN". Maurice Meisner, in his biography of Li Ta-chao, describes Li as possessing "the quality of amicability that marked his personal relationships and the feeling that he was 'the friend of everyone'". (187) Meisner futher speaks of Li's "almost innate propensity for 'united front' type activities", and this might have motivated Li to give his support to the liberals' "Manifesto for the Struggle of Freedom" in August 1920, despite the fact that he and Hu Shih had exchanged polemics in the "Problems & Isms" debate a year earlier. Again in early 1921, in the dispute over the future of HCN, Li was prepared to support the move back to Peking (without a commitment not to discuss politics) to avoid an open split among the ranks of the HCN intellectuals, despite the fact that he must have approved of the new editorial direction taken by Ch'en Tu-hsiu and the Shanghai Communist group. Li and Hu Shih were to remain good friends, despite their increasing political divergence, until Li's death in 1927 which was later mourned by Hu Shih in the dedication of the third collection of his writings published in 1930.(188)

On the other hand, according to Jerome Grieder, in his

biography of Hu Shih, the relationship between Hu and Ch'en was not so close. Ch'en was of a more fiery disposition and he had departed from Peking in early 1920. But their relationship after 1921 was far from one of personal animosity. When Ch'en was arrested again in Shanghai in 1922, Hu interceded with the authorities on Ch'en's behalf in order to secure his release.(189)

But the parting of ways in early 1921 was irrevocable in the sense that henceforth Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Hu Shih were to devote themselves to their respective ideologies, and worked through different means towards two different conceptions of the new China. The split in early 1921 also brought about a change-over in the personnel associated with HCN. Virtually all those who had been main contributors to the HCN (with the exception of course of Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao) ceased to be actively concerned with the magazine, apart from the occasional vernacular poems or translations from Western literature. These members were Kao I-han, Chang Wei-tz'u, Wu Yü, T'ao Meng-ho, Wang Hsing-kung, Chou Tso-jen, Lu Hsün (who did not assume leadership of the left-wing writers until 1930), Liu Fu, Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung, Hu Shih, Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei and Shen Yin-mo. They were to be replaced by members of China's first generation of Marxists. Such a change-over could not but have great significance and influence for the movement at the time. It is this and a summary of the period leading up to the split that we will turn to in the final section.

13. Conclusion

In January 1920, on the inside-front-cover of Volume 7 Number 2 of the magazine, HCN announced the publication of a combined volume of the back numbers published between September 1915 and December 1918. Part of this announcement reads as follows.

> Although HCN is a magazine that always tries to move forward, each volume has its own particular

> colour, and each issue and each article has its own particular spirit. Even though the questions (discussed in these back numbers) are no longer talked about, they are still valuable articles for us to read, since they were closely related to the time when they were published. ... The HCN could well be considered as a book entitled "A History of the Changes in Chinese Thought in the Last Five Years". What are manifested here are not only the changes in thought of members of the (New Youth) Society, but also the changes in thought of society at large.(190)

These words sum up succinctly the changes brought about by the impact of the events of the May Fourth Incident: an increased commitment towards political activism and a new interest in socialist ideas, and a concomitant feeling of disenchantment with the West.

As we have seen in this chapter, all these developments were both reflected and further developed in the pages of HCN in the months after May Fourth. They were the underlying factors that brought about the split between the liberals and the Marxists in early 1921. Writing in December 1921, at the end of the "Problems & Isms" debate, Hu Shih summarised in the following four phrases his conception of what the new intellectuals should be engaged in. "The study of problems, the introduction of learning, the re-evaluation of tradition, and the re-creation of culture".(191) In retrospect, the "Problems & Isms" debate was the first occasion in which there was an open dispute among the ranks of the new intellectuals. Chinese historians of today look at the debate in the following light.

> The debate concerning problems and isms was the first time that proletarian thought carried out a counter-offensive against bourgeois thought. It struck at the misrepresentation and slander against Marxism-Leninism by the bourgeoisie, it criticised the reactionary philosophy of pragmatism of the bourgeoisie and their reformism in the era of imperialism, and it spread the influence of Marxism-Leninism in China. After this debate, a section of the bourgeoisie, that is, its right wing under Hu Shih, took to the road of compromise and capitulation.(192)

A year after the May Fourth Incident, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was committed to Marxism, and HCN came under the effective control of the Communists in Shanghai and became part of the activities of China's first Communists. The split among the HCN intellectuals in early 1921 was followed by similar developments in some of the radical organisations founded in the New Culture Movement or in the wake of the May Fourth protests. In 1920, Mao Tse-tung's New People's Study Society (Hsin-min hsüeh-hui 新民學會) in Hunan divided into a left and right wing, and it was in the winter of 1920 that Mao Tse-tung embarked on his revolutionary career in the organisation of Hunanese workers. In the latter part of 1920, the Chinese students in France also divided into two factions; with the nationalists and anarchists on one side, and the Communists on the other. At about the same time, Tai Chi-t'ao and other nationalists were also moving away from their involvment with the Marxists.

Indeed, the change in editorial direction of HCN from the latter part of 1919 to the split among its members in early 1921 is reflective of developments among China's new intellectuals at the time. At the same time, by its reputation as the leading new periodical, HCN further accentuated these developments. The early New Culture Movement, with its "Mr. Democracy" and "Mr. Science", was succeeded by a movement that was consciously more political, greater in urgency, and more direct in its approach. When such a situation arose, those who had previously worked together found themselves more and more in situations in which they had to take a specific stand. The parting of ways among the new intellectuals in 1921 was but the thin end of the wedge that was to divide them into antagonistic camps whose struggles were to be a part of China's history in the decades to come.

CHAPTER 4. HCN AS A MARXIST MAGAZINE, MARCH 1921 - JULY 1926.

1. Background Events.

After her humiliation at Versailles, China's position in relation to the Great Powers continued to deterioriate as the latter continued their bid to wrest further privileges and concessions out of a weak and disunited China. In the period after the First World War, the influence of Japan and the United States was particularly on the rise in the Western Pacific region, and their conflict of interests was reflected in the course of events in China. The United States and Britain gave their support to the warlords Ts'ao K'un and Wu P'ei-fu, while Japan backed Tuan Ch'i-jui and Chang Tso-lin. The early 1920s saw a series of civil wars between these factions, with the control of the Peking government going to whichever faction that was victorious. In the summer of 1922, Li Yüan-hung with the support of Wu P'ei-fu, became the president of the republic. Wu then proceeded to reconvene the "Old Parliament" which Tuan Ch'i-jui had dispersed in 1917. A new and supposedly permanent constitution was to be drafted to provide some semblance of legitimacy to the government. For a brief period, hopes were raised that the North and the South might be reunited without resort to armed conflict, but these proved to be unrealistic. In March 1923, Sun Yat-sen established a revolutionary government in Canton, and this was soon followed by the reorganisation of the Kuomintang along Leninist lines. In September 1924, Wu P'ei-fu was turned out of Peking by the forces of Chang Tso-lin.

On the international scene, the Washington Conference on Naval forces took place in November 1921, and it was agreed that the naval forces of the United States, Britain and

Japan would be in the respective ratios of 5, 5 and 3. But a development that had greater impact on the Chinese situation was that the United States and Britain recognised Japan's interests in China, and all nine of the Conference's participant countries, including China, affirmed the Open Door policy in China. The Chinese intellectuals followed the Conference with close interest; the Eastern Miscellany, a moderate, progressive magazine, published a special number on the background to the Conference two months before it was due to take place (1), and HCN also devoted four articles to the Conference. The Marxist intellectuals were now openly suspicious and critical of the motives of the Great Powers. Commenting on the "deep illusions" of some Chinese intellectuals who believed that a righteous United States would ensure justice for China at the Conference, Ch'en Tu-hsiu wrote candidly of his view of the nature of the Conference.

> In this age of imperialism which is the inevitable end-product of the system of private capital, every one (of the Great Powers) uses the pretext of free competition to swallow up the weak. Except in the unlikely event that the Great Powers would give up their colonial policies and destroy their own commerce, how would they be able to advocate humanism to help the weaker peoples. ..... In particular, if China would not put up an immediate and strong resistance, it would only be a matter of time before she would be either carved up or ruled jointly by the Great Powers.(2)

On the question of disarmament, Ch'en believed that the aim of the Great powers was to lower tension between themselves; there was no intention of discontinuing their oppression of the weaker peoples, since their existing arms capabilities were more than sufficient to implement their colonial designs. On the specific question of the Far East, he believed that the Washington Conference was to be an opportunity for the Great Powers, especially the United States, to agree amicably to a sharing out of the spoils and consolidate their existing interests in the

region, and that the weaker nations would further suffer in consequence.(3)

Five months before the Washington Conference convened, in July 1921, the representatives of the various Communist groups met in Shanghai to formally establish the Chinese Communist Party, and to hold the First Party Congress. There were two delegates from each of the six Communist groups, and a representative from the Chinese radicals in Japan. Among those present were Mao Tse-tung, Chang Kuo-t'ao, Tung Pi-wu and Ch'en Kung-po. Neither Ch'en Tu-hsiu nor Li Ta-chao were present, being respectively in Canton and Peking.(4) The First Congress agreed upon a constitution for the Party, and elected Ch'en Tu-hsiu as general secretary.(5) The goal of the Party was declared to be the overthrow of the capitalistic classes" with the "revolutionary army of the proletariat" to "adopt the dictatorship of the proletariat" towards an abolition of classes.(6)

In line with their orthodox Marxist conceptions, the participants also decided upon the establishment of a China Labour Union Secretariat (Chung-kuo lao-tung tsu-ho shu-chi-pu 中國勞動組合書記部) to help with their organisational work among the industrial workers.(7) The Secretariat soon had branches in some of the main cities in China, and won for itself a leading position in the First All-China Labour Conference(Ch'üan-kuo lao-tung ta-hui 全國勞動大會) which was convened by the CCP in Canton in May 1922. In that year, the influence of the Party spread rapidly among the urban proletariat, a development that must have further bolstered the Marxist intellectuals' faith in their creed. The period January 1922 to February 1923 has been described by Chinese Communist historians of today as "the first high-tide of the Chinese

workers' strike movement". It began with the Hong Kong seamen's strike, and reached its high-point with the strike of the Peking-Hankow Railway workers. There were over a hundred strikes, involving a total of more than 300,000 workers.(8)

However, the Party's policy of relying solely on the urban proletariat as the revolutionary force came under attack at the Congress of the Toilers of the Far East in January 1922. Lenin's ideas on the liberation of the colonies were first formulated for the Second Comintern Congress, held in July 1920, and formally adopted by the International after a debate with the Indian Communist, M.N.Roy. In his discussion of the "national and colonial question", Lenin spoke of the harnessing of the national revolution in Asia for the goal of world revolution, and the final thesis adopted by the Comintern Congress affirmed that the European and Asian revolutions should be linked up, and that the local Communist parties in the colonial territories should ally themselves with the "national-revolutionary" movements, even though the latter were likely to be of a bourgeois-democratic nature. (9) Such a formulation had little influence on the strategy of the CCP until the First Congress of the Toilers of the Far East held in Moscow and Petrograd in January 1922. At this meeting, at which representatives from both the CCP and the Kuomingtang were present, the Chinese delegates were told that the two great enemies of the oppressed peoples of China and other Eastern countries were imperialism and feudalism, and that the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal national-democratic revolution in a semi-colonial and semi-feudal China had to ally itself with the bourgeois nationalists. (10) This postulation was reflected in the resolution passed at the Second CCP Congress in July 1922 which declared that the proletariat, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie

were all allies in the national-democratic revolution.(11) Thus at the prompting of Moscow, the first theoretical basis was laid for the later KMT-CCP collaboration.

The question of collaborating with the Kuomingtang formed the central issue at the Third Congress of the CCP, held in Canton in June 1923. It was decided that individual members of the CCP would join the Kuomingtang which was now regarded as the centre of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It was also at this Congress that Mao Tse-tung was first elected to the Central Committee of the party. The admission of CCP members to the Kuomingtang was confirmed at the latter's First Congress in January 1924, also held in Canton. The Kuomingtang was now regarded by the Chinese Communists as a bloc of four classes, that of the proletariat, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoise.

At the CCP Fourth Congress held in Shanghai in January 1925, the matter of developing the national revolution was discussed. It was decided that the Party's work among the industrial workers should be expanded, and the Party should involve itself further in the organisation of peasant associations among the peasantry.(12) One result of this Congress was the establishment of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions (Chung-hua ch'üan-kuo tsung-kung-hui 中華全國總工會) at the Second All-China labour Conference held in May 1925. This was closely followed by the occurrence of the May 30th Incident in which a protest demonstration against Japanese treatment of Chinese workers in a Shanghai textile mill was fired upon by the British Concession police. Three weeks later, a demonstration in Canton organised in protest against the May 30th Incident was in turn fired upon by the British and French police. These two incidents, involving scores of fatal casualties, sparked off a storm

of fervent nationalist protest. The protest strikes of industrial workers, merchants and students started in Shanghai, and quickly spread to Peking, Hankow, Changsha, Hangchow, Canton and Hongkong, involving hundreds of thousands of workers. The CCP was very active in the organisation of this protest movement, and established various links with the urban workers, especially by assisting in the setting up of trade unions. The movement was particularly successful in the Kwangtung area where there were protests by both the urban population and the peasantry. This greatly consolidated the revolutionary area centred around Canton, and was to be a contributory factor in the launching of the Northern Expedition in the following year. The May 30th Movement lasted well into 1926, and was significant in its forging of nationalist links between the various sectors of Chinese society.

In 1926, the warlord Chang Tso-lin was in control of North China, while Wu P'ei-fu was powerful in Central and Central-South China. Backed by their respective foreign allies, these two warlords were considered by the Nationalist and Communist revolutionaries in the South as powerful obstacles in the struggle of the national revolution. Their removal and the reunification of China were the two main aims of the Northern Expedition which was launched in July 1926. The CCP was a prominent partner in the Northern Expedition, particularly in the area of political work. The Party also took the opportunity of carrying out organisational work among the peasantry. The Northern Expedition had reached the Yangtse region by 1927, and it was in Shanghai and Nanking on April 12th that Chiang Kai-shek carried out his coup d'état against the CCP. The slaughter of thousands of Communists and leftists and the disbanding of leftist organisations heralded the end of the collaboration

between the KMT and the CCP.

2. THE PUBLICATION OF HCN IN THE 1921 - 1926 PERIOD.

The first issue of HCN published in Canton was volume 8 number 6 which came out in April 1921. This issue had originally been scheduled to come out on February 1, and as noted, the three-month delay was due to the seizure of the printing-plates by the French Concession police in Shanghai. This incident coincided with the discussion between Ch'en Tu-hsiu and others as to whether the magazine should be moved back to Peking. Subsequent to the seizure, the publication of the magazine was moved to Canton.

By the time of the move to Canton, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was already in Canton, following his appointment as the commissioner of education of Kwangtung province in December in the previous year. Ch'en resumed his editorship of the magazine until July 1922 when volume 9 number 6 came out, the last of HCN monthly issues. During this period, the magazine was published by the New Youth Society in Canton.

After the July 1922 issue, there was a lapse of nearly a year before the next issue of the magazine was published on June 15, 1923. The magazine was now described as a quarterly, and Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai had succeeded to the editorship. An announcement on the inside-front-cover of the first quarterly number gave the reason for turning the magazine into a quarterly.

> Ever since this magazine first became acquainted with our readers, we have been engaged in combat with all kinds of devils, and it has been resurrected from death on several occasions. Last year, due to the dual pressures of political and financial factors, we were unable to carry on publication. We offer our deep apologies to those readers who love to read our magazine. We have since mustered up our forces for a final struggle. In order to conserve our human resources and finance,

> and improve on our contents, we have decided to change the magazine into a quarterly. (13)

As for the change in editorship from Ch'en Tu-hsiu to Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, there is no evidence to suggest that Ch'en was involuntarily relieved of his position. It seems probable that he passed on the editorial responsibilities to Ch'ü for the simple reason that he was now preoccupied with his duties as the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, an explanation that is supported by the description of the situation in the announcement just referred to.

With the reorganisation of HCN into a quarterly, the magazine also officially became "the theoretical organ of the Central Committee" of the CCP.(14) The magazine had of course showed its Marxist commitment ever since it came under the effective control of the Shanghai Communist group in May 1920. However, right up to the last monthly number in July 1922, the pages of the magazine would still show occasional traces of the early New Culture Movement, such as in its publication of vernacular poetry. This fact is now acknowledged by Li Lung-mu, a Chinese Communist historian of today, who records that after the founding of the Party in July 1921, the magazine was made into the official organ of the CCP, and it was just under two years later, in June 1923 when the first quarterly number was published, that the HCN became the theoretical journal of the Central Committee.(15) But on becoming a quarterly, the HCN became, to all intents and purposes, a much more deliberate and pronouncedly Marxist publication, though its Marxist commitment had been quite evident from mid-1920.

Altogether, four quarterly issues of HCN were published: in June and December 1923, and in August and December 1924. The editorial office and publisher in 1923 was given as the Common

People Bookshop (P'ing-min shu-she 平民書社) in Canton, while the two 1924 issues were edited and published by the New Youth Society in Canton. Both these organisations were controlled by the CCP.

In the last quarterly number of HCN published in December 1924, there was an announcement that after the next issue, to be published in the following month, the magazine would revert to being a monthly periodical. The announcement reads in part as follows,

> In the last twelve months, most of us working on this magazine have been engaged in concrete social activities, and we have been beset with difficulties with respect to time and finance. It was for this reason that we reorganised the magazine into a quarterly, in order to conserve human and financial resources and to improve on our contents. In the last year, thanks to the affectionate support of our countrymen, our readership has been expanded. However, readers at home and abroad who love our magazine have written to us on a number of occasions to say that a quarterly frequency in our publication has made difficult the discussion of various questions. Some have written in to blame us for not publishing monthly, and there was no lack of people who have written in to offer their help in terms of sending articles and money in order that we might resume publication.
> To satisfy the requests and hopes of our readers, we who work on the magazine feel that we could not shirk our responsibilities. Thus we have decided to intensify our struggle, and to resume monthly publication from January 1925 onwards.(16)

But it turned out that such a promise could not be fulfilled, and the next number of HCN did not come out until four months later in April 1925. One possible reason for this delay could be the work involved for the convening of the Fourth CCP Congress which was held in Shanghai in January 1925. The April 1925 number was the first of five irregular issues of HCN, the second was published in June of the same year, and the last three were published respectively in March,

May and July in 1926. There was no volume number on any of these last five issues, and they were only referred to as No. 1,2,3,4, and 5. Hence these last five numbers of HCN will hereafter be referred to as the irregular numbers.

It is not difficult to see why HCN was changed from a monthly publication into a quarterly, and then further into a periodical that was published irregularly. The conditions for publication in China at the time could not have been ideal, and for radical periodicals there was the added pressure of government suppression. Even during its early years when it was published as a monthly in Shanghai, the HCN suffered gaps and delays in its publication. Prior to its becoming a quarterly, the HCN averaged 8.2 issues per year in the period September 1915 - July 1922, but this average dropped to only 2.9 issues per year in the period June 1923 - July 1926, during which the magazine was first a quarterly and then an irregular periodical. The split with the liberals in February 1921 could not have removed very much of the magazine's financial resources since the next six monthly issues were all published on schedule, and as for the human resources, there was soon a new group of active members. However, after the establishment of the Party, it seems that these new contributors were quickly drawn into the party's organisational work, and the production of HCN suffered in consequence. The early 1920s was an eventful period for the infant Communist Party, especially after the Third Congress had decided in July 1923 to collaborate with the Kuomintang. At the same time, the CCP membership numbered only 432 at the time, and this was only increased to 950 in early 1925 (17)

It seems that, as the CCP became increasingly involved in concrete organisational work among the masses, there was a shift in its propaganda work towards publishing periodicals that were

directed at various categories of readership. At this time, perhaps because of the previous high esteem it had enjoyed among the intellectual community, HCN was designated to appeal to "intellectuals in general", both Communist and non-Communist ones.(18) But with the party's new effort in seeking grass-root support, in particular among the workers and youths, there was now less emphasis placed on appealing to the intellectuals. Concomitant with this change in the readership, the Party was arriving at a shift in emphasis in the contents of the party's publications from general theoretical discussions to reports and analyses of the concrete revolutionary situation. This seems to be the likely reason behind the formation of Guide Weekly (Hsiang-tou chou-pao 嚮導週報) in September 1922. As Li Ta noted,

> From this time onwards, HCN became a periodical that openly propagated Marxism and reported on the conditions in Soviet Russia, whereas Guide Weekly was the party organ that propagated the party's proposals and strategy. (19)

The development towards seeking greater grass-root support and the new emphasis on the concrete revolutionary situation in the editorial contents of the party's publications could well be part of the reason why, simultaneously with the designation of HCN as the theoretical organ of the Central Committee, the magazine was reorganised from a monthly to a quarterly publication.

It is not difficult to see where the CCP's publication resources were going. From July 1922 on, when the last monthly number of HCN appeared, the magazine was in fact the least frequent of the party's publications. In September of the same year, Guide Weekly was enlarged from having eight pages to eighteen pages, and did not cease publication until July 1927. (20) Thus there appeared to have been a decision by the party not to give priority treatment to HCN in the allocation of resources.

It was a combination of such factors as a limited supply of manpower and resources, and a change in the party's publication policy, that forced HCN to be less and less frequent in its publication, and finally ceased altogether in July 1926. There is no specific reference anywhere as to why the magazine stopped publication at this point, but it is not unreasonable to assume that it was the activities of the Northern Expedition, launched that month, which finally stopped the publication of the magazine. Martin Wilbur has noted that the shortage of CCP's leadership personnel was particularly felt at the time of the Northern Expedition when there was a rapid growth in mass organisations.(21)

As for the personnel associated with HCN in the 1921 - 1926 period, even prior to the open split in February 1921 between the liberals and the Marxists, the former's writing had been appearing less and less frequently from May 1920 when HCN came under the control of the Shanghai Communist group. However, after the magazine's move to Canton, it still occasionally carried the odd contribution from the group who remained in Peking. Such contributions were generally of a literary interest, such as vernacular poetry or translation from foreign literature. It is discernable from the pages of HCN that a change in personnel and contributors had taken place by the end of 1920. The new members were mostly young Marxist intellectuals in the Shanghai Communist group. None of them had the same national reputation as those in the Peking group, but they had the dual advantage of being in Shanghai, where the magazine was at the time being edited and published, and that they shared with Ch'en Tu-hsiu a commitment to Marxism. The active members of HCN in its Marxist phase were Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, (who succeeded Ch'en Tu-hsiu as the magazine's editor), Chên Wang-tao, Li Ta, Chou Fo-hai, Chang Sung-nien and Shen Yen-ping (better known under his pen-name of Mao Tun). (For

biographical notes on these persons, see Appendix A.) Apart from these men, others who had written several articles for HCN during the 1921-1926 years included Li Chi 李季 , Ch'en Kung-po 陳公博 and Tai Chi-t'ao, (the latter two before they broke with the Marxists in 1922). Ch'en Tu-hsiu continued to be an active contributor, but Li Ta-chao's last contribution was in the last monthly number in July 1922; he was no doubt preoccupied with his political activities in the North, and was also hampered by the geographical distance between Canton and Peking.

3. HCN'S NEW MANIFESTO IN JUNE 1923

As mentioned in Section 2, HCN became a much more deliberate Marxist periodical in its tone and contents after its reorganisation into a quarterly in June 1923 when it also became "the theoretical organ of the Central Committee" of the CCP. Other aspects of the Party's work, such as its internal and external affairs, and its organisational activities among workers and youths, were dealt with by the Party's other publications such as Guide Weekly, Pioneer and "The Communist" (which are described in Appendix C.) In the 1921-1926 period, HCN seemed to provide a forum in which the ideas of Marx and Lenin could be presented and discussed, and to report on socialist movements abroad, in particular the developments in Soviet Russia. Such intentions were well-presented in "The New Manifesto of New Youth", published as the first article in the first quarterly number in June 1923. It was unsigned, but judging by the literary style, was probably written by Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai who had just became the magazine's editor. It was also likely that the New Manifesto met with the approval of the party, as in the following month Ch'ü was elected to the Central Committee at the Third Congress. Since this document deals in considerable detail with the editorial policy and contents of the magazine in the 1923-1926 period, it is discussed here at some length.

The first part of the Manifesto gives a resumé of the nature and work of HCN in its previous years in the context of a Marxist interpretation of recent Chinese history. It remarks first on the early anti-feudal work of the magazine.

> The New Youth Magazine is a product of the Chinese revolution. As China's old society crumbled in decay, this was the hour of birth of New Youth. During this process of collapse, New Youth could not have done otherwise than become the representative of the new thought. It launched the first frontal attack on the old culture which has oppressed in all kinds of ways the common labouring people of China. (22)

Then there follow comments on the 1911 Revolution and the May Fourth Movement, which throw light on the early Chinese Communist's interpretation of these two events, and directly give their evaluation of the work that they themselves were engaged in. They saw the 1911 Revolution as merely the outward collapse of a feudal imperial court, while the traditional ideology and gentry education had been left virtually untouched. "Inside the door of China, on which is hung the sign-board of 'Republic', there is neither any freedom nor equality to speak of." As for the May Fourth Movement, their interpretation was that the movement was the immediate forerunner of the struggle they were now engaged in.

> Ever since the May Fourth Movement, we can see quite clearly that the existing life in Chinese society is in the process of drastic transformation, and the tendency is towards a real revolution. This is why the spirit of New Youth will be felt all across China, and will prevail over the entire society. Unintended by us, the New Youth has become the pioneer in the thought of China's true revolution. (23) (emphasis in the original)

What follows next in the Manifesto is perhaps its most important part. It offers first an analysis of the revolutionary situation in China at the time, and then describes HCN's work in relation to the task at hand. As will be made quite clear in what follows, this analysis of the Chinese revolutionary situation was based on that of the orthodox Marxist view which the young

Chinese Communist Party had adopted at the time. A more favourable assessment of the revolutionary potential of the national bourgeoisie was only to be adopted, at the prompting of Moscow, at the Party's Third Congress in the following month. This section is given in full here.

> The present old society in China is not only a clan-based society, but it has also suffered the same fate as the world's proletariat in having fallen into the tiger's mouth of world capitalism. Therefore, since the dark and reactionary old forces in China rely on world imperialism to safeguard their power and privileges, the Chinese bourgeoisie naturally also rely on world imperialism and constantly want to compromise with it. This means that only the labouring classes can take up the enterprise of China's true revolution. Numerous events in the recent history of Chinese society have borne out the following fact— that, without the guidance of the labouring class, not even the bourgeois revolution could be completed. The bourgeoisie will no doubt lose their bearing and sell out mid-way. In the final analysis, the true liberation of China is the enterprise of the proletariat. Thus, the duty of New Youth consists of giving correct guidance to Chinese social thought, and of providing the weapon of knowledge to the common labouring people of China. New Youth must become the compass of the Chinese proletariat. (24, emphasis in the original)

The Manifesto then proceeds to describe the various aspects of the editorial contents of the magazine, that would carry out the overall aim of making HCM a proletarian periodical. The Manifesto gives five aspects of work the magazine would be engaged in, as follows.

1. The search for a scientific solution to social problems, i.e. the discussion and propagation of Marxist ideas.
2. The study of the political and economic conditions of China.
3. The cultivation of a revolutionary spirit by literature and arts.
4. The analysis of the social situation in other countries.
5. The struggle against social thoughts of a non-Marxist persuasion. (25)

The first, second and fourth points will form the headings

for the following three sections in this chapter. Under each, we will examine in turn the HCN group's reasons for having such an aim, how and to what extent this aim was realised in the editorial contents of the magazine in the 1921 -- 1926 period. The reason that the third point on revolutionary literature and arts will not be discussed is that in fact the magazine paid virtually no attention to this aspect, being satisfied with carrying the occasional translation of foreign literature. The final point on combating other ideologies will be more appropriately discussed in the next chapter which will deal with the disposition and conflict of ideas in China in this period.

The Manifesto concludes with the following "solemn declaration to Chinese society".

> New Youth has once been the pioneer in thought in China's true revolution,
> Now New Youth is also the compass of the Chinese proletariat. (26)

4. HCN'S DISCUSSION AND PROPAGATION OF MARXISM

In this section we shall first look at the discussion of Marxist ideas in HCN by examining the relevant contributions of the magazine's main members. This is followed by several overall observations of such discussion. The section concludes with a description of HCN's work in the translation of the writings of Lenin, and its effort in making available books on socialism.

In this infant period of Chinese Communism, a comprehensive understanding of Marxism among the CCP members was not yet prevalent. Even among those who may be described as having a grasp of the ideology, both personal interpretations and varying emphases were noticeable. The best examples of this phenomenon are Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao, both of whom, though having a similar overall Marxist world-view, lent their own particular coloration and personal predilection to their Marxism. In the

writings of the early members of the Party, the absence of discussion of one aspect of Marxism could be as illuminating as the emphasis placed on another. Thus the HCN, being at the time a theoretical organ of the party, provides evidence that throws light on the conception of Marxism by the Chinese Marxists in this period. After the HCN became an official organ of the CCP, one of the first party members to become a regular contributor on Marxist ideas was Li Ta, who was appointed head of the propaganda department at the founding Congress. In an article entitled "The Revival of Marxism", Li first gave a summary of the main tenets of Marxism, and then gave his reasons for what he saw as a decline of Marxism in the latter part of the nineteenth century. From the historical point of view, according to Li, "the essence of Marxism was completely destroyed after it had been laid waste by the German Social-Democratic Party." In particular, Li was critical of Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel who founded the party, and of both Bernstein and Kautsky. Li accused them of bringing about the degeneration of Marxism "from internationalism to nationalism, from socialism to liberalism, and from an ideology that advocated revolution, class struggle and direct action to one that advocated reformism, class compromise and parliamentarianism". (27) From the theoretical point of view, Li believed that the historical-materialist view of the inevitability of a socialist revolution had been deliberately misinterpreted into a postulation that a revolutionary movement would be unnecessary. Li emphasised that, although the polarisation of society into the two classes of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat would be a natural outcome of a developed capitalism, it was essential to promote the strength of the proletariat. "If we neglect this class mentality and class self-awareness (of the proletariat), or if we do not help to promote the movement of the

class struggle, then the social revolution would not be forthcoming." (28)

As expressed in this article, Li's view of Marxism was typical of the orthodox Marxism which the CCP adopted in its early years. For Li, it was of the greatest importance that the essence of Marxism should not be tampered with in any way. After the founding of the CCP, the belief was widespread among its members that the party should not have any dealings with other political parties, lest it might be contaminated by the latter's ideological impurities. In Li's article discussed above, which was published in January 1921 prior to the establishment of the CCP, he further emphasised the importance of the independence of labour unions (lao-tung tsu-ho 勞動組合) from any political parties, and that only the labour unions were capable of truly representing the labouring class in the latter's struggle against the capitalists. (29)

Finally, Li saw a revival of Marxism in the last twenty years in the growing awareness of the proletariat, and in particular, in the implementation of Marxism by Lenin in Soviet Russia. To him Marxism, which had previously degenerated at the hands of the German Social-Democrats, was now, thanks to Lenin and others, once again "in all its glory, and restored to its true face." (30)

In his contributions to HCN, Li Ta did much to translate into Chinese foreign articles on the developments in Russia. He gave attention in particular to the position of women in Russia, and translated two articles, both from Japanese, one on the new Russian marriage law, and the other on the liberation of women in Russia. He also translated an article published by Lenin in 1920 on the liberation of women's thought and the measures taken towards this end in Russia.(31)

But then there was the vexing question of whether Marxism would be applicable in a China that was barely industrialised.

Li Chi, another of HCN's new contributors addressed himself directly to this subject in an article, "Socialism and China", published in the April 1921 issue of HCN and perhaps Li's most important contribution to the magazine. At the beginning of his article, Li wrote that one of his reasons for writing was to refute the arguement of what he called the "new die-hards" (hsin wan-ku 新頑固) who were then putting forward the idea that, if China was to achieve socialism, she could not bypass a period of capitalist development, and hence the task at hand for all socialists should be the promotion of capitalism. (32) A large part of Li's article was an attempt to show that capitalism was already a real enough phenomenon in China at the time. What was more, he asserted, because the Chinese capitalists did not have sufficient capital themselves, there was also an influx of foreign capital. Thus the capitalist exploitation in China was in fact all the more intense: there was not only exploitation by foreign capitalists, but also by native capitalists who were under the wings of the foreign capitalists. He gave the Chinese mining and banking industries as examples where this dual exploitation existed. (33) But Li did not confine his description of capitalism in China to the urban-industrial sector, but also described capitalism in the countryside. He believed that, with the inequitable distribution of land in rural China, the natural outcome was that there were a great many tenant farmers and landless peasants under the capitalist yoke of land-owners. (34) After his descripton of capitalism in Chinese society, Li concluded that socialism should be "the fine medicine for the salvation of China" (35)

Another early party member who started to write for the HCN at the same time as Li Ta was Chou Fo-hai. Like Li Ta, Chou was also a returned student from Japan, and in fact took part in the party's founding Congress in his capacity as the representative

of the Chinese students in Japan. His main contribution to the discussion of Marxism in HCN was his discussion on the factor of economic determinism in the socialist revolution. One of his articles, published in June 1921, was essentially a refutation of the idea that economic determinism would be the sole dynamic factor in the socialist revolution. To Chou, an equally crucial factor was the class struggle. He argued that members of a society were not completely at the mercy of the social forces, but that the two were capable of manipulating each other. Thus just as the proletariat could hasten the arrival of the socialist revolution by class struggle, so the bourgeoisie could also postpone it by their action. (36) In a later contribution to the "Random Thoughts" column in the magazine, Chou again took up his discussion of the danger of relying solely on economic forces in bringing about socialist revolution. He cited Russia as an example in which a socialist revolution had succeeded in a country which was not economically advanced, and Britain and America as examples where a socialist revolution had not taken place despite a highly-developed economy. (37)

Such then were the contributions made by Li Ta, Li Chi and Chou Fo-hai to the discussion of Marxism in HCN. As for Li Ta-chao, as already mentioned, after the magazine had moved to Canton in February 1921, he was preoccupied with the organisation of Communist activities in North China. Thus it was not surprising that there were only two articles by Li in HCN after February 1921, and none at all after the magazine was reorganised into a quarterly in June 1923. The first of these two articles, dealing with the background and events leading up to the October Revolution, has already been discussed in the last chapter. The second article, entitled "The politics of the common people and the politics of the workers", was published in July 1922. It consisted of a straight-

forward comparison of the Marxist conception of democracy with the bourgeois one. But when Li came to a discussion of the difference between Marxism and the other varieties of socialism, he was much less condemnatory of what the other members, such as Li Ta, regarded as dangerous revisionism.

> "To put it simply, the movement of a socialist party is a movement of the petty-bourgeoisie, while the movement of a communist party is a movement of the proletariat. A socialist movement is creative evolution, while a communist movement is creative revolution. Members of a socialist party are the central and right factions, while members of a communist party are the extreme left faction." (38)

Such a postulation might perhaps be a reflection of Li's general propensity for a "united front", discussed earlier in section 12 of the last chapter. But perhaps a more likely explanation is that Li was attempting to formulate some sort of a theoretical basis for cooperation with bourgeois-democratic forces, a policy which was called for in the resolution of the First Congress of the Toilers of the Far East earlier in January, that the struggle in China should be basically anti-imperialist and anti-feudal in nature.

As for Ch'en Tu-hsiu, his writings continued to be featured prominently in HCN after its move to Canton in February 1921. Not only was Ch'en editing the magazine in Canton until its reorganisation into a quarterly in June 1923, but he was also the party's first secretary-general from July 1921. In the present account of the discussion of Marxism in HNC, it might be noted that up till the end of 1921, the majority of Ch'en's writings in this period were published in HCN, and so these may be taken as an important guage of his view of Marxism at the time. However, after the foundation of the CCP's organ, Guide Weekly, in September 1922, the bulk of Ch'en's writings appeared there. (39) As for the discussion of Marxism in HCN after it had been reorganised into a quarterly in

June 1923, the main writer on the subject was Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai. Thus it is appropriate first to examine Ch'en writings on Marxism in HCN, and then those of Ch'ü.

When Ch'en Tu-hsiu resumed HCN's editorship in Canton in Febraury 1921, he had already committed himself to Marxism for some months. In the second issue of HCN published in Canton, he made a contribution to the "Random Thoughts" column with a piece entitled "The cultural movement and social movement". In it, he attacked those who believed that the salvation of China lay in cultural transformation. Ch'en himself, of course, had also previously subscribed to this view, and thus he was not only attacking his former colleagues who were still clinging to such an idea, but was also consciously rejecting his own ideas during the New Culture Movement.

> The most unfortunate thing is that there is this group of people who have a curious habit of relying on short-cuts. They consider the cultural movement as a direct tool with which to reform politics and society. They go so far as to say that "The cultural movement has been in existence for two or three years now, yet there is still no hope for the country. The cultural movement is going to fail again." This group of people not only fail to see that the cultural movement and the social movement are two different matters, but they do not even understand what culture is.(40)

As with other early Chinese Marxists, Ch'en also concerned himself with the discussions of the appropriateness of socialism to the Chinese situation, and in particular, with why the Marxist path would be the only correct one for China. With respect to the first question, the appropriateness of socialism in China, Ch'en gave it a most succinct discussion in an article published in July 1921. He first asserted that, with the advances in communications and transport, national boundaries had lost some of their original meaning. In particular, he went on, "modern human economic relationships" were now conducted more on an international than national basis. Thus if there were to be a collapse in the other economies,

China would bound to be affected. At the same time, if China were to adopt a socialist form of economic production, she would inevitably come up against the economic and political oppression of the capitalist countries. Then he went on to put forward five reasons why such difficulties should be overcome: (1) it was essential that China develop her industries, but it would be a folly to adopt the capitalist mode which had already produced crises in the industries of Europe and America; (2) in relation to Europe and America, the Chinese people were a proletarian nation, and so only a victory of the proletariat could wrest China from a situation of crisis and dependence; (3) any change in the international situation could only start with changes in one of the countries; (4) since the conclusion of the First World War, the capitalist system had already been shaken to its foundations, and so the Chinese people should unite with their comrades in other countries in a movement to transform the international scene; (5) any mild form of state management of China's industries and foreign trade would still continue to mean foreign intervention. For the above five reasons, Ch'en argued that there was not only a possibility that socialism could be adopted in China, but there was indeed a most urgent need to do so. (41)

After establishing the need for implementing socialism in China, Ch'en went on in the same article to discuss which form of socialism should be adopted, a discussion which he deemed essential, since he believed that if one should just take up some "general and vague direction", one might in fact be helping to consolidate capitalism. He enumerated five varieties of socialism which he believed to be of some influence in the world: anarchism, communism, state socialism, syndicalism, and guild socialism. He first rejected syndicalism and guild socialism, the former for its surrender of the control of the state to the bourgeoisie, and the latter for the same drawback and

lack of overall control of the national economy.(42) Coming to anarchism, Ch'en asserted that this ideology assumed the existence of both an inborn goodness in man and of universal education, but he believed that both were in fact lacking and could only be brought about by political and economical reforms, which were in turn rejected by the anarchists. The greater part of Ch'en's discussion was reserved for a comparison between Marxism and democratic socialism (or state socialism, as he put it), and he outlined four shortcomings of the former which the latter did not suffer from. Firstly, he criticised the democratic socialists' cooperation with the bourgeois political parties as tantamount to sabotage of both the unity of the proletariat and of the class struggle. Secondly, he argued that the bourgeoisie would not allow the use of the parliamentary system as an instrument for the destruction of capitalism. Thirdly, from the political point of view, the reality of bourgeois democracy was nothing but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Fourthly, democratic socialism, as practiced by the German Social-Democrats, was nationalistic in its outlook and relied on the support of the bourgeois countries, whereas Marxism, as practiced by the Russian Bolsheviks, was internationalistic in its outlook and supported the other proletarian countries in the world.(43)

> "With respect to these two varieties of socialism, which one should we Chinese people choose? I believe that it is undeniable that the transformation and very existence of China depends on the help of the international socialist movement. Although the native bourgeoisie in our country is still as yet not highly developed, everybody knows about the oppression of foreign capitalism, and so the Chinese people should promote the idea of class warfare. If we open our eyes, we can then see the corruption and impotence of the bourgeois politicians, and the untrustworthiness of the parliamentary system. Both democratic politics and the parliamentary strategy are even more corrupt in China than in Europe and America. Thus if China were to adopt the state socialism of the German Social-Democratic Party, it would be but to provide an even greater opportunity for misdeeds

for the useless and corrupt bureaucrats and politicians.(44)

In July 1922, Ch'en published an essay in HCN, entitled "The ideas of Marx", being essentially a straight-forward description of Marxist principles relating to surplus value, historical materialism, the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat.(45) Such ground had of course been covered earlier on by Li Ta-chao in his two-part essay, "My Marxist view", published in 1919. But Ch'en must have felt that, with the growing interest in Marxism and the formation of the party the year before, there was a need to give a summary of the basic Marxist tenets. But at the same time, Ch'en, as with all the other members of his generation of Chinese Marxists, was not so much interested in Marxism as an intellectual entity but as an instrument to transform China rapidly. This sentiment was of course very pronounced in the writings of all the early Chinese Marxists, and was not a surprising one, given the situation of China at the time. As far as Ch'en Tu-hsiu is concerned, this sentiment is very well illustrated by an article, entitled "The world revolution and the movement for the liberation of the Chinese people", published in the last irregular number of HCN in July 1926, a year prior to his dismissal as the secretary-general of the party.

In this article, Ch'en first stated that the international economy was under the grip of imperialism, and the corollary of this situation was that the world revolution consisted of the intimately-related struggles of all workers, peasants, and the oppressed nations of the world. As far as China was concerned, the country was being exploited by not just one single imperialist power, but by the international imperialist forces acting in concert. Ch'en regarded such an international imperialism as the biggest enemy facing the country. The country's

warlords, who were aiding and abetting imperialism in the latter's exploitation of the country, constituted another enemy. Ch'en believed that the first step towards the liberation of China should be the removal of these warlords, but the liberation of China would only be completed with the defeat of imperialism.(46) In this process, according to him, the help of Soviet Russia and of the world's proletariat would be absolutlely essential, since China could only achieve its own liberation as part of the success of world revolution. This in turn could only succeed after a protracted struggle by a united front of the proletariat of the world, of which China was part.(47) Finally, in one of the concluding paragraphs of his article, Ch'en made a comment that forshadowed the contemporary view that the Chinese revolution is a possible "model" for other countries in the Third World.

> In politics, China is a country that has been collectively conquered by international imperialism. In economics, China is a market that has been collectively plundered by international imperialism. .....Therefore, the background to the movement of the liberation of the Chinese people and the inevitable path that it is going to tread, can be recorded as the illustration of the model of the relationship between the liberation of all peoples and the world revolution. (45, emphasis in the original)

There is of course an important qualification to this comparison. In the account of Ch'en's discussion of Marxism given above, we find that he had virtually failed to devote any discussion to the question of the peasantry. Indeed, he was to be later censured by the party for disregarding the peasantry. It seems fair to say that, to Ch'en, the political backwardness of the Chinese people could not be better illustrated by the rural inhabitants of the hinterland, and his commitment to orthodox Marxist ideas did not give any hint as to the revolutionary potential of the peasantry. At the same time, this neglect of the peasantry was by no means exclusive to Ch'en, and was shared by his colleagues on ECCI. The extent of the discussion

in HCN concerning the peasantry will be fully discussed in the following section.

Turning to Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai's contribution to the discussion of Marxism in HCN, we find that he tended to concentrate on the discussion of the strategy and tactics that should be adopted by the Chinese Communist Party. In addition, he was also concerned with explaining the nature and function of the Comintern, with which he was no doubt familiar, having stayed in Moscow between 1920 and 1923. In the first article Ch'ü published in HCN in June 1923, for example, entitled "The Social transformation of the world and the Comintern", he provided a history of the Comintern and discussed its programme.On the importance of the Soviet Union and the Comintern to the world revolution, he had this to say.

> World capitalism is in a process of decline and break-down, whereas the Soviet Union is daily growing stronger and consolidating its strength. The proletarian revolutionary movements in the various countries are on the rise, and they are also growing stronger. The struggle between the two sides will be a critical one. In this struggle , the Soviet Union and the Comintern are the central forces that work towards the liberation of the world proletariat and all the exploited peoples of the Far East.(49)

In another article in the same issue, entitled "Today's labour-management war and revolution", Ch'ü further discussed the correct strategy that should be adopted by a Communist Party, and by implication, by the Chinese Communist Party. He stressed that in any movement against the "old social system", the communist party must lead the proletariat who should in turn unite and lead the labouring masses, the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie.(50) This postulation was of course part of the official line, adopted a year earlier at the Second Congress, that the Chinese revolution was only in the national-democratic stage. A policy that went one step further, that the CCP should collaborate with the Kuomintang, was suggested to them by Moscow at the special plenum in August, and this new policy was

officially adopted by the Third Congress of the CCP which was held in July 1923, a month after the above article by Ch'ü was published. This new position was reflected in his next article on the subject, entitled "From democracy to socialism", published in HCN in December 1923. He now argued that the Chinese revolution was in the bourgeois-democratic stage, and thus for the time being the national movement should take precedence over the socialist movement. In his summary of the present task at hand, Ch'ü quoted the following passage written by Ch'en Tu-hsiu.

> "We must strive to expand the organisation of the Kuomintang all over the country, so that the revolutionary elements in China are concentrated in the Kuomintang, in order to meet the present needs of the Chinese national revolution. ..... The present political struggle is obviously the national movement -- a movement to eradicate the foreign powers and warlords. Thus, among the masses, we need to have a large-scale propaganda for the national movement, to promote the Kuomintang of the national revolution. At the same time, we should do our utmost to recruit into our own organisations those revolutionary elements who not only understand the need for the national revolution, but also have a class consciousness. In addition, we should spread widely among the masses the message that 'part of the purpose of the national movement is the promotion of the interests of the labouring class' " (51, emphases by Ch'ü)

Modern Chinese historians have credited Ch'ü with the affirmation in this article that the Chinese revolution was at the time in the bourgeois-democratic stage.(52) But on this very same question, Ch'ü was not so favourably viewed for his "left opportunist line" when he was the party's leader in the months between August 1927 and July 1928. The 9th Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Comintern was held in Moscow in February 1928, and Ch'ü was charged with the Trotskyist sin of telescoping together the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution. It is not the

place here to discuss whether such a charge was justified, suffice it to note that he might have indeed interpreted the Comintern's own sanction in September 1927 of the break with the Kuomintang and the call for the establishment of soviets, as the signals hailing the end of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and its passing over into the socialist stage. Finally, as an ironic side-comment on Ch'ü's supposed Trotskyist tendencies, he published in the June 1925 issue of HCN a most closely-argued critique of Trotskyism for its "opportunism". (53)

The above then is a description of the respective contributions to the discussion of Marxism in HCN by the magazine's four main contributors on the subject. Several comments may now be made on HCN's general presentation of Marxism in the years, 1921 - 1926. Around the time of the founding of the CCP in 1921, it appeared that many of the early Chinese Marxists felt that there was a general misunderstanding of the contents of Marxism on the part of the other progressive intellectuals, not to mention the general public. In January 1921, for example, Chou Fo-hai remarked that a number of the progressive periodicals were publishing articles on Marxism only because it was the latest intellectual fashion to do so, and that the writers of these articles possessed very little knowledge of the contents of Marxism, and had even less idea as to how it should be implemented in China.(54) Chou's comment may of course be taken as an indication of the interest in Marxism among the new intellectuals of the time. But at the same time, it is an equally valid observation on the extent of the knowledge of Marxism, since, as we shall see, sometimes even the articles in HCN itself did not show a full understanding of Marxism.

Here we come to a point of discussion, as to how one should define a "Marxist". This is a problematic point, and has occupied the energies of Marxists of various descriptions since the days

of Marx, and I do not propose to go into it; but for the purpose of the present description of Marxism in HCN, and indeed, throughout this text, I have taken to describe a person as a Marxist when he proclaims himself to be one. In this sense, members of HCN in this period were all Marxists, even though on occasions they might have shown an inadequate understanding of Marxism. Indeed, in a historical light, the divergencies from orthodoxy are the more interesting. At the same time, it must be noted that the ideological unorthodoxies of the Chinese Marxists at the time of the founding of the party were only minor ones, and they could not be taken in any way to invalidate the criticism made by the early Chinese Marxists of those whom they believed to be following alien ideologies, since it was those who were associated with the party, including the contributors to HCN, who consistently declared themselves to be Marxists. It is in this context that the present description is made of HCN as a Marxist magazine, that the magazine was, from February 1921, a publication in the complete control of those who felt consciously that they were Marxists, despite the fact that they had different degrees of understanding and interpretation of Marxism between them.

At this point, it may be useful to summarise several of the more important themes that recurred in the discussion of Marxism in the pages of HCN in this period. The point of departure in the theoretical framework of the Chinese Marxists was their affirmation that capitalism, though not yet in a fully-fledged stage, was a real enough evil in Chinese society. Both Li Chi and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, for example, argued that capitalism was all the more pernicious in China in that it operated on a dual mechanism, in the form of both native capitalists and the more powerful foreign imperialists. After this establishment of the existence

of capitalism, the Chinese Marxists then proceeded to put their case why Marxism, as against other ideologies and in particular as against other forms of socialism, was the only one that would offer China a real solution to the eradication of capitalism and the establishment of socialism. We have already described in this section the Marxists' general theoretical argument against democratic socialism and other progressive ideas from the West. In the next chapter, we will describe the various concrete controversies that were waged between HCN and other groups.

In their presentation of Marxism, the HCN group repeatedly emphasised that the economic determinism in Marxism should not be interpreted to mean that any conscious activities by men would not be capable of propelling Chinese society on the road to socialism. The frequent assertion of this point was no doubt prompted by their opponents' charge that the Marxists themselves were tampering with the underlying forces of history. Chou Fo-hai and Li Ta, for example, both argued on occasions that the class struggle was essential and integral to the progressive development of history. Indeed, from the very outset, virtually all the Chinese Marxists had been concerned with the "dynamic" aspect of Marxism, that is, in regards to finding a way in which Marxism could be directly relevant to the Chinese situation then. In the next section, we shall describe the various analyses in HCN of various sectors of the Chinese society, including the extent of its discussion on the peasantry.

Finally, another point that was discussed in HCN was China's place in the international proletarian movement. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, in particular, both emphasised that the international economy was now one, and that the native bourgeoisie in China and foreign imperialism relied on each other in their exploitation of the Chinese nation. To defeat these enemies, it was necessary for the Chinese people to unite with other oppressed

peoples and the proletariat in the metropolitan areas of imperialism. In another following section in this chapter, we shall describe HCN's reports on the labour movements in other countries, and in particular, its extensive coverage of the developments in Soviet Russia.

In this summary of the discussion of Marxism in HCN, one finds that the thinking of the Chinese Marxists was already interacting with their primary concern with China. Generally speaking, it might be said that before the influence of the Comintern was felt, the Chinese Marxists' early ideological orthodoxy was little disturbed by their perception of the conditions in a China which would be difficult to describe as an archetypal capitalist society depicted in orthodox Marxist terms. One might say that it is somewhat ironic that this harmonious relationship between this ideological inclination and perception of the Chinese situation could in fact have been sustained by the relative ideological immaturity of the early Chinese Marxists. From 1922 on, the Comintern assumed an important role in the formation of the CCP's strategy. Moscow did so, as much out of an ideological adherence to Marxism-Leninism, as, if not more, out of a consideration of her own national interests. With the death of Lenin in early 1924, the latter consideration virtually took complete precedence over the ideological one. Indeed, it may be said that in Stalin's China policy, ideological platitudes were often used to cloak the pursuit of the Russian national interest.

But at the same time, the first generation of Chinese Communists were not just Communists, but also Chinese Communists, and as far as the question of ideological fidelity is concerned, signs of a "voluntaristic interpretation" of Marxism were already present, and some of these could be found in the pages of HCN. This process was of course to be taken to fruition later on by Mao Tse-tung, but it really began with Li Ta-chao, and virtually every member of

China's first generation of Marxists contributed to it.

In August 1921, the month following the foundation of the CCP, Ssu Ts'un-t'ung 施存統, one of HCN's contributors in this period, in an article entitled "The Communism of Marx", spoke up against the danger of a wholesale and unquestioning acceptance of Marxism. Ssu believed that Marxism was originally based on the conditions of highly industrialised societies, and so not all of it was applicable to countries where industrial development was still in an early stage. What was important, he asserted was that the essence of Marxism should be extracted, and then implemented in China. He summarised his argument as follows.

> We know very well that if we are to put Marxism into practice in China, on the surface, part of this process may clash with the teaching of Marx. This is not important, because Marxism itself is not a lifeless model. Therefore, I believe that all we have to do is to adhere to the basic principles of Marxism. As for its subsidiary policies, we do not have to follow them to the letter. (55)

Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, in an article published in June 1923, also distinguished between fidelity to the basic principles and the subsidiary issues of Marxism. Chü chose to formulate his discussion on a distinction between the strategy and tactics of a political party. He defined strategy, or what he preferred to describe as a party's platform, as the demand for a more advanced system to replace the existing one, and part of a process to bring one step nearer the "highest ideal society". As for tactics, Ch'ü defined them as the methods by which the various classes in the present society were persuaded to adopt a better system.(56) He then went on to argue for the desirability of changing one's tactics according to circumstances, and sometimes even changing part of the party's platform.

> Since the class relationships in a given society in a given period may follow changes in

> the political and economic circumstances, the proletariat, who at present occupy the central place in the world's revolution, should clearly observe such changes, and constantly determine its tactics of struggle for transforming society. Thus tactics can be changed at any time, in order that the highest party platform, which is unchanging, can be achieved. ..... The party platform in turn can be distinguished into its higher and lower components, and the latter can also be changed if the circumstances call for it. (57)

As mentioned earlier on, the early Chinese Communists' discussion of the possibility of an implementation of Marxism that was to be not totally rigid might have been due to their observation that, whereas Russia could just conceivably be described as an industrialised society in Marxist terms, it was difficult to do so in the case of China. This observation was of course behind their opponents' criticism that China was not economically ready for socialism, and thus the discussion of the possibility of a somewhat flexible approach to Marxism might also have been a tactic in itself to make Marxism a more attractive body of ideas to those outside the party. At the same time, their discussion at this time did not envisage the extent to which Mao later formulated his adaptations of Marxism, with his emphasis on the peasantry and the role of protracted rural guerilla warfare. In the first years of the CCP, the emphasis in the party line was still on the role of the urban proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, if not in the class struggle for the establishment of socialism. To put it in another way, when one speaks of the ideological orthodoxy of the early Chinese Communists, perhaps it would be more appropriate to say that their policy was orthodox in the sense that it was more orthodox than the one formulated later by Mao, than to say that their policy derived from a totally rigid reading of Marxism.

A contributory factor to the ideological orthodoxy of the early Chinese Communists was that the writings of Lenin on the national and colonial question were not readily available in

China on any scale until a year or so after the establishment of the CCP. For example, prior to its reorganisation into a quarterly in June 1923, the HCN had only carried three translations of Lenin's writings - "National Self-determination" (translated in November 1920), "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and one other on the liberation of women (both very short pieces and carried in the June 1921 issue of HCN) (58). Thus, one of the above-mentioned themes of the discussion of Marxism in HCN in the 1921 - 26 period, that of the postulation that the struggle in China was part of the world revolution, only occurred after 1923 when the Chinese Communists were more familiar with the Leninist theory of imperialism. It was after it had become a quarterly that the HCN began to translate the writings of Lenin on some scale. For example, the December 1924 issue of HCN was a special number on the national revolution, and this carried the translations of such well-known Leninist tracts as "The National & Colonial Questions", "Backward Europe & Advanced Asia", "The Awakening of Asia"and "Regenerated China". Indeed, according to Chang Ching-lu, from 1920 when HCN made the first Chinese translation of a tract by Lenin to 1926 when the HCN ceased publication, there were a total of thirty Chinese translations of the writings of Lenin. Of these thirty, eleven were published in HCN, eight were published in "The Communist", one of the CCP's other periodicals, and the other eleven in an assortment of other periodicals.(59) The April 1925 issue of HCN was a special commemorative number on Lenin on the first anniversary of his death (which was in January 1924, but there was no HCN published in the first three months of 1925). In this issue, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai made a translation of part of Stalin's just-published book, "The Foundations of Leninism".(60)

In this Lenin commemorative issue, both Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai and Ch'en Tu-hsiu pointed out the creative contributions Lenin had made to Marxism. Ch'ü argued that both Marx and Engels lived in

the era of the bourgeois revolution, and so the most they could do was to outline the theory of the proletarian revolution, and they were not in a position to set forth in details how the proletarian revolution was to be carried out and how the dictatorship of the proletariat was to be established and maintained. But Lenin lived in the era of imperialism, a period in which the proletariat's struggle was much more real and its likelihood of success much higher. Out of his concrete experience, and basing himself firmly on Marxism, Lenin was able to formulate new and detailed principles on such questions as the dictatorship of the proletariat, the peasantry, and the relationship between the social revolution of the proletariat and the national revolution in the colonial countries. Ch'ü concluded as follows:

> Marxism is a theory for the revolution of the proletariat, but it is only the outline of a theory for social revolution in the era of industrial capitalism which precedes the proletarian revolution. As for Leninism, it is the Marxism in the era of proletarian revolution and imperialism - it consists of the principles by which the revolution of the proletariat is to be put into reality." (61, emphasis in the original.)

For Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Lenin had also "clearly affirmed Marxism, set it forth in greater details, and expanded on it". Ch'en believed that Lenin's contributions were particularly important in two matters: on the dictatorship of the proletariat and the international nature of the anti imperialist national movements. Ch'en added that, as far as China was concerned, Lenin's ideas on the latter were especially relevant.(62)

Apart from publishing articles and translations in its pages, HCN also promoted the spread of Marxist ideas through the HCN book series. The publication of this series began towards the end of 1919 when the New Youth Society was organised in Shanghai.(63) From that date to January 1921, eight books were published in the series. These included Kirkup's "History of Socialism", Russell's "Problems of Philosophy" and "Roads to Freedom", G. D. H.

Cole's "Self-Government in Industry", J. M. Keynes' "The Economic Consequences of the Peace", J. H. Hartley's "Syndicalism", and Kautsky's "Class Struggle".(64) The choice of the above books was in itself a capsule comment on the then transitional stage in HCN's ideology. As we saw in the last chapter, it was at this time that there were increasing discussions in HCN of various socialist ideas. It was also interesting that all the books published at this time were translations from Western works .

Following the move to Canton in February 1921, the HCN book series, like the magazine itself, underwent a change towards a definite commitment to Marxism. In 1923, the New Youth Society was amalgamated with the Canton Common People's Bookshop (Kwang-chou p'ing-min shu-she 廣州平民書社), and it was their joint effort that continued to publish the New Youth book series. (65) In 1923, they published their first book, "A collection of essays concerning socialism" which consisted of Ch'en Tu-hsiu's discussions with various people on a comparison of various socialist ideas. This was followed by a book on the labour movements abroad, and one on the strike of the Peking-Hankow railroad-workers.(66) At the same time, the series also brought out a great many books that promoted the knowledge of Marxism in China. These included Marx's Communist Manifesto , his ideas on wage labour and capital, and an introduction to Das Kapital; a biography of Lenin, and two books respectively on his writings on the formation of Soviets and the nature of the Workers'-Peasants' Government; a history of the Russian Revolution, the Constitution of the CPSU, and the resolution and declaration of the Third Communist International.(67) In 1924, the New Youth Society also published a collection of speeches by Ch'en Tu-hsiu, mainly on the theme of the relevance of Marxism to China.(68) The next book known to be in the series was not published until 1926, undoubtedly due to the same set of circumstances that turned the HCN first from a monthly into a

quarterly, and then a periodical of irregular frequency. The book published in 1926, however, was the well-known one, "A collection of essays concerning the question of the Chinese Revolution" (Chung-kuo ko-ming wen-t'i lun-wen chi 中國革命問題論文集). The essays in this volume were selected from the pages of the Communist journals at the time, and an advertisement in HCN claimed that it offered "the most correct guidance with regard to the strategy of the Chinese revolution".(69) In the last issue of HCN published in July 1926, an advertisement listed twenty-seven books published by the New Youth Society. Apart from some of those mentioned above, there were materials on the Chinese maritime customs question, the unequal treaties, the problem of young workers, and the position of women(70). The popularity of the books published by the New Youth Society was shown by the fact that, after the Society had ceased to exist in 1926, many of the titles in the New Youth book series were republished by other bookshops.(71)

5. HCN's Reports on Aspects of The Chinese Struggle.

In this section, we shall be looking at HCN's coverage and discussion of the concrete revolutionary situation in China. A discussion of the CCP's analysis of the Chinese situation in the 1921 - 26 years does not fall within the scope of the present thesis. The intention here is rather to show what part the magazine played in this aspect of work of the party. As was indicated in Section 2, the HCN was very much the theoretical organ of the party, while the other Communist periodicals, of which Guide Weekly was the foremost, largely concerned themselves with the discussions of specific concrete issues, local problems and intra-party matters. In the last section, we have already examined HCN's discussion of Marxism, and in the following section, we will look at its coverage of the situations in other countries. One could say that these two components in the magazine's editorial contents would naturally appeal more to an intellectual readership than to workers, who

were more concerned with real, everyday problems directly affecting them. Indeed, in the 1921-26 period, there was only a handful of articles in HCN that were basically detailed and straight-forward accounts of specific problems in Chinese society. There were in fact more articles of this type in its 1919-20 years, when the editorial direction developed from a general interest in socialist ideas to a commitment to Marxism. It seems that, after the formation of the CCP, such articles found outlets in the other publications of the party.

In this section, we will concentrate on two things. The first is the extent to which HCN reported on and discussed the reality of the revolutionary struggle in China. The second is the extent to which the question of the peasantry was discussed in HCN in the years, 1921-26.

As mentioned, there were only a few articles in this period that directly dealt with the everyday reality and struggle of the labouring people. Only two articles in this category can be identified in 1921. The first was a report on the poor working conditions and brutal treatment of the coal-miners in Hunan, and the second was a reproduction of a statement issued by several unions in Shanghai which called for the establishment of a workers-only conference to discuss national policy.(72) Publicity was also given to the First Congress of the Socialist Youth Corps, an offshoot of the newly-founded CCP, which was held in Canton in May 1922, immediately following the First All-China Labour Conference, and the resolutions adopted by it were reproduced in full in the July 1922 number of HCN.(73) The four quarterly issues of HCN between June 1923 and December 1924 did not carry any noteworthy reports on the Chinese labour movement. The next significant article on this subject was a long article published in the June 1925 irregular number. This was a lengthy account by Chang Kuo-tao of the Chinese labour movement since the

establishment of the CCP, and in particular the causes and consequences of the "February 7th Tragedy" of 1923 in which the warlord Wu Pei-fu suppressed the Peking-Hankow railroad-workers' strike and thereby virtually destroyed the main proletarian base of the CCP in North China.(74) The fortunes of the party's work among the urban proletariat picked up considerably again during the May 30th Movement in 1925, and this was described by Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai in the March 1926 issue.(75) In the same issue, a column of "A Daily record of the Revolution" (Ko-ming jih-chih 革命日誌) was started and this ran for the remaining two issues of the magazine, listing in some details the events of the struggle in the first five months of 1926.

The above-mentioned articles were virtually the extent of HCN's factual coverage of the situation in China in the 1921-26 period. The much larger part of the editorial contents was made up of theoretical discussions of Marxism, reports on the situations in other countries, and translations of the writings of Marx, Lenin and the Comintern— in keeping with the idea that HCN was the party's theoretical journal. Futher evidence of this was suggested by the magazine's "New Manifesto", published in the first quarterly number in June 1923 and discussed in Section 3. A section of the Manifesto was headed by the line that "HCN should study the concrete political and economic situation in China." This section criticised some "Chinese-style new Utopians" for not having an adequate knowledge of the model they were proposing for China. It went on to assert that these people also lacked an understanding of Chinese society, a shortcoming that was due to their lack of knowledge of the methods of social sciences and the subsequent inability to deduce objective principles from the observations of reality. The result was that they either failed to see the wood for the trees, or else escaped into the realm of speculation.(76) This criticism indeed echoed Li Ta-chao's criticism of the position of Hu Shih during the "Problems & Isms"

debate of summer 1919. The New Manifesto emphasised that the study of specific problems should be made in conjunction with an overall identification of the nature of society and the direction it should take. What it referred to as "the methods of social sciences" were of course the principles of Marxism. It seemed that, as we have seen, HCN in its 1921-26 years was more concerned with the discussion of Marxism, while the study of specific problems in Chinese society was allocated to the other Communist periodicals.

As for the discussion of the political stategy of the party in the national revolution, as against more or less straightforward reports of the situation and struggle in China, there were again only a handful of articles of this nature in HCN, the main venue for them being Guide Weekly. Sullivan and Solomon, in a statistical analysis of the contents of HCN, point out that the movement-building category of articles, consisting of those articles which dealt with the strategy, tactics and internal organisation of the CCP, is relatively not as substantial as the other categories of articles.(77) (A discussion of the conclusions of Sullivan and Solomon's content analysis will be found in the concluding chapter.)

In the 1921-26 period, there were only a few articles in HCN which dealt directly with the question of the political strategy of the CCP. In the December 1923 issue, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai discussed the ideological reasons for collaboration with the Kuomintang. The CCP's strategy in the national revolution was further discussed in two articles in the December 1924 issue. The two articles were written respectively by P'eng Shu-chih and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, two party members who were both later to be criticised for their opportunism. Li Tang-mu's criticism of P'eng's article, "Who are the leaders of China's national revolution?" is that he completely dismissed any revolutionary potential on the part of the national bourgeoisie in the national revolution.

In his article, P'eng had described the Canton Government as "nothing but a group of new warlords and bureaucrats who are offering empty support to Sun Yat-sen." (78) This, according to Li, is tantamount to relinquishing the proletariat's leadership of the democratic revolution. (79) While P'eng is accused of "left"opportunism by Li, Ch'en is accused of "right"opportunism as manifested in his article in the same issue, "The lesson of the Chinese national movement of the last twenty-seven years". Li's criticism is that Ch'en failed to deal properly with the contradiction that existed between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and in doing so, weakened the position of the proletariat. (80) While Ch'en might be criticised for failing to examine in this article the relationship between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the conclusion he reached in this article in fact indicated that Ch'en was as much a supporter of proletarian leadership as the Comintern line at the time would allow.

> The main lesson that we should draw from the national movement in the last twenty-seven years is this. Of all the classes in society, only the proletariat, the final class of mankind, is a revolutionary class that is least prone to compromise. It is also the natural enemy of international capitalism and imperialism. It is not only the most important army of the socialist revolution in the capitalist and imperialist countries, it is also the commander of the national revolution in the countries that are oppressed by imperialism. (81)

Such discussion of the strategy of the national revolution was not intended to be an important part of HCN. Indeed, Li Lung-mu today identifies only one positive component in the party's policy which he believes HCN had helped to initiate. This was the discussion, prior to the start of the Northern Expedition, about the CCP having its own armed units. Li gives the credit to Ch'ü-pai for pointing out, in the March and May 1926 issues of HCN, the lesson of the May 30th Incident and the March 18th (1926) Massacre and the necessity for both the training of regular forces and the arming of the workers. Li mentions in particular

Ch'ü's article, "The Question of Armed Struggle in the Chinese Revolution", published in the May 1926 issue of HCN, in which he argued that regular forces of the revolutionary army should be the spearhead of the Northern Expedition. Li credits Ch'ü for standing up against the Central Committee's opportunist line on this question of armed struggle, as personified in the person of Ch'en Tu-hsiu.(82)

We now come to an account of the discussion in HCN of the question of the peasantry in the national revolution. It must first be noted that such a discussion was by no means a recurrent theme in the magazine, since the early Chinese Communist leaders were at the time looking to the urban proletariat as the main motive force of the Chinese revolution. The references to the peasantry in HCN were, more often than not, only made in passing in the discussion of some other central topics. Given the later course of the Chinese revolution, it is for reason of historical interest that such a description is presented, and in this section on China, and not in the previous one on Marxism.

Ironically, the most radical piece of writing in HCN on the peasantry was published as early as August 1921. This was a reproduction of the declaration of a peasants' association at Ya-ch'ien 衙前 in Chekiang province. The declaration condemned "the world ruled over by the bourgeoisie" as one that brought suffering and injustice to the peasants and workers. The declaration was quite unequivocal as to what the peasants should do.

> Our future lies in our awakening. Unity through organisation is the path by which we can change our bad life into a good one. Working for our future is indeed the same as working for the future of the entire Chinese people.

The declaration concluded with a call for the control and redistribution of all land by associations organised by peasants.(83) It was about peasants' associations such as this that Mao Tse-tung was to write so enthusiastically in February 1927 in his "Report of an Investigation into the Peasant Movement in Hunan".

But in the early 1920s, the CCP hardly paid any serious attention to the Chinese peasantry. In the September 1921 issue of HCN, there was a reprint of a speech made by a Hsüan Lu to an audience of peasants. Hsüan did first give some sort of a class-analysis of the economic relationships in the Chinese countryside, and put it to his peasant audience that their long-term aims should be the abolition of private property and the public ownership of land. But on the question as to how these aims were to be achieved, he did not mention anything about the possibility of help from either the CCP or urban workers ; instead he suggested to the audience that, as a "short-term remedy", that they should follow the examples of the Ya-ch'ien peasants (whose declaration is referred to above) and organise themselves into a peasants' association.(84)

Hsüan Lu at least believed that the peasants were capable of change, whereas some early Communist writers went as far as to depict the peasants as possible inhibitors of change. For instance, in the "Random Thoughts" column of the same issue in which Hsüan's speech appeared, Chou Fo-hai wrote that part of the reason for the necessity of adopting the dictatorship of the proletariat in China was that her peasantry was so conservative. Chou argued that the peasants were used to the system of private property, and so they would initially be against the socialist revolution. Thus he believed that it would be absolutely necessary to use the proletarian dictatorship against them to prevent them from standing in the way of the socialist revolution.(85) As for Ch'en Tu-hsiu, he also spoke of the peasantry in this vein. In an article published in December 1924 in which he discussed the lessons that could be drawn from the national movement since the turn of the century, he bracketed the peasantry together with artisans, revolutionary intellectuals, the lumpen proletariat (soldiers and bandits) and minor merchants as elements in the movement that were prone to compromise and which had to be firmly led

by the proletariat.(86) In his fall from the party leadership in August 1927, Ch'en was to be charged with compromising the agrarian revolution. This was perhaps somewhat unjustified, since Ch'en was restricted by the Comintern's directive that the agrarian revolution should also be conducted under the leadership of the Kuomintang.(87) Perhaps it should also be mentioned that it was shortly after the publication of Ch'en's above article that Mao Tse-tung began to discover the revolutionary potential of the Chinese peasantry, in particular as manifested during the May 30th Movement, and it was in the summer of 1925 that he began to organise the peasant movement in Hunan.(88)

In the pages of HCN in these years, the view that the peasantry could be anything more than a subordinate element in the national revolution was never challenged in discussion. There was, for example, no reference to Li Ta-chao's article, "Land and the Peasants", published in six parts between December and February 1926, in which Li firmly looked to the peasantry as the major force in the Chinese revolution. Up to and after April 1927, the views of Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Ch'ü Ch'u-pai on the peasantry were dominant in the Central Committee. As both Schwartz and Meisner have shown, although Ch'ü had criticised Ch'en's leadership over the question of the agrarian revolution, their positions were in fact similar, and both were in agreement with the official policy in 1926 of restraining the upsurge in the peasant movement.(89) In the last number of HCN in July 1926, Ch'ü gave a general assessment of the peasant movements in the world. He acknowledged that a large part of his article was based on Soviet writings on the subject, and concluded that, whereas a proletarian party would have a clear view of how a better society would be brought about, an organisation of "small-scale farmers" (hsiao-nung 小農) would be only concerned with their own immediate needs.(90)

Thus the reports and discussions of the Chinese situation in

HCN in the 1921-26 period did not show any surprising divergence from the official party analysis of the nature of the national movement and the concomitant emphasis of the role of the urban proletariat. The number of such reports and discussions was relatively small in comparison with their number in 1919-20, since the HCN was now designated as the theoretical organ of the party.

6. HCN's Reports on the Proletarian Movements Abroad.

A section of the magazine's New Manifesto published in the first quarterly number in June 1923 was headed by the following line: "HCN should broaden the world-view of Chinese society by summarising and analysing the social conditions in the world today." The Manifesto explained that this was necessary because China was now entering the international stage, following a period of cultural isolation of more than three thousand years. But a more important reason was that the proletarian struggle was now an international one, so China could learn from the experience of other labour and revolutionary movements. In this respect, the Manifesto concluded, HCN should study the situation in other countries (91). In this section, we shall be looking at HCN's reports on the work of the Comintern, its coverage of the situation in other countries, in particular that in the Soviet Union.

The June 1923 issue in which the New Manifesto was published was in fact a special number on the Comintern. A note appended at the end of the Manifesto explained why the Comintern was such an important organisation.

> Since the HCN is the pioneer in Chinese social thought, it will now make an even more realistic study of society than before in order to seek the weapons of knowledge that will help with

> the concrete movement of the common people and workers. Today, the Comintern is the most progressive of the various factions in social sciences, and it also has the most intimate relationship with the concrete movement for world revolution. This is the reason why, following its reorganisation (into a quarterly), the HCN is specially publishing this 'Comintern Number' as its first issue.(92 my parenthesis.)

In this special issue, there were Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai's three articles on respectively the origins,programmeand strategy of the Third International. There was also a report on the Fourth World Congress of the Comintern held towards the end of 1922, and a translation of a resolution by the Congress on the revolutionary movement in the East. In the following issue published in December, HCN also reported on the meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the Comintern which was held in June of that year. Such reports on the work of the Comintern continued to appear in the pages of HCN until it ceased publication in 1926, together with periodic translations of the documents of the Comintern.

As for HCN's coverage of the events in other countries, the selection of the subject matter reflected the party's emphasis on the role of the proletariat in the national revolution. Apart from general surveys of the international workers' movement, there were specific reports on the workers in France, India, and Britain. There was also a report each on the national revolution in Turkey and Morocco. Many of these reports were in fact translations of the articles from the publications of either the Comintern or the indigenous Communist movements, often appended with a short translator's note to explain what China could learn from a particular movement. Apart from the above, there were also general analyses of the international economy, with an article each on the modus operandi of British and American imperialism. In its three years of publication as a quarterly and then as an irregular periodical, HCN published only two articles on foreign peasant movements, one a general survey

of the world peasantry, the other a report on Western European peasants, and both being translations from articles in Comintern's publications.(93)

All the above reports on foreign countries were overshadowed by the emphasis placed on reporting developments in Soviet Russia. We have already mentioned that a "Studies of Soviet Russia" column was started as early as September 1920. Although the column itself was discontinued after the July 1921 issue, reports on the Soviet Union continued to take up a large part of the magazine, with an increasing number of articles and translations that went towards an ideological explanation of the events and policies in that country. Such reports covered such subjects ranging from the Soviet marriage system to the Red Army, from the biographies of the Soviet leaders to the New Economic Policy, from the electrification programme to the Soviet peasantry, and from the minorities question to a complete translation of the Soviet Constitution promulgated in 1924.

The New Manifesto in June 1923 said that the HCN would seek to "broaden the world-view of Chinese society". The form this process took in the pages of HCN in the 1921-26 years reflected the change in view-point of the Communist intellectuals concerning China and the problem of transforming her society. In their New Culture days before the May Fourth Incident, they considered China to be some sort of a special case among the nations of the world, and that a great part of the country's weakness lay in her own particular cultural heritage. A corollary of such an analysis of the uniqueness of China was that the cure of the Chinese patient should also be geared to the individual characteristics of her disease, and the solution the New Culture intellectuals put forward was a wholesale transplant of Western ideas into the minds of the Chinese people. But with their commitment to Marxism, a section of the new intellectuals ceased to regard China

as such a unique case. Their Marxist analysis told them that China was but going through a particular phase in human history, that some countries were in the same situation while others had gone past it or were still about to arrive at it. Such a determinist view of history, coupled with the postulation that the Chinese revolution was intimately entwined with the course of world revolution, inevitably brought about a broadening of the internationalist horizon of the Chinese Communists, part of which was an ideological and internationalist sympathy with the national and proletarian movements in other countries. This element of internationalism entered into, and reacted with the nationalism of the Chinese Communists, and the amalgam has survived to this day.

In the period of the 1920s, nationalism, rather than internationalism, was the stronger component in the world-view of the Chinese Communists, and such a relationship has also survived to this day. The internationalism that was part of the Leninist theory of imperialism proved to be not as strong as the counter-pull of modern Chinese nationalism that had been simmering over the decades and burst forth during the May Fourth years. Indeed, at times the early Chinese Communists did not hesitate to interpret Lenin's ideas on imperialism as a justification for nationalism. Encausse and Schram have drawn attention to an example of this phenomenon in the writings Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao. In November 1918, in his article "The Von Kettler Monument" published in HCN, Ch'en had described the Boxers as a fiasco that epitomized all of China's backwardness in the face of the West. Yet six years later, in an article published in Guide Weekly in November 1924, Ch'en was now glorifying the Boxers as a national movement against foreign imperialism. (94) As for Li Ta-Chao, his nationalism was even more pronounced. In a speech delivered in May 1924, he chose to describe the clashes between nations as essentially

a manifestation of their "racial differences". Although he added that a rejuvenation of the Chinese nation would only be possible in a context of a transformation of her culture, he concluded his speech as follows.

> We must all advance courageously with all our force, we must once again appear on the stage of nations to display our national characteristics, we must once again in the history of our nation and in the history of the world clearly manifest our national spirit. (95)

These selections from the writings of Ch'en and Li in 1924 illustrate the continuity of the nationalist sentiment in the early Chinese Communists who had earlier participated in both the New Culture Movement and the May Fourth protest. Even for Ch'en Tu-hsiu, much more of a westerniser than Li and others, nationalism was a powerful component in his world-view.

Therefore, to sum up the evolving relationship between nationalism and internationalism in the ideological makeup of China's first generation of Marxists, it may be said that their primary concern with the fate of the Chinese nation was the basic motivation that led to their commitment to Marxism. To a limited extent, their view that the revolution in China was part of the world revolution introduced an element of internationalism into their world-view, but this was never strong enough to challenge the nationalistic component. Indeed, the early Chinese Communists interpreted Lenin's ideas concerning revolution in the East in such a way as to make them into an ideological rationalisation for their nationalism.

7. Conclusion

It can be said that the influence of MCN during its Marxist years on the Chinese intellectual and political scene was not as great as it was during the New Culture Movement. Of the more important May

Fourth periodicals, HCN was the first to be established in 1915, and its style of journalism, format and contents were all subsequently copied upon by other new periodicals. An even more significant fact is that throughout the latter half of the 1910s, the editorial committee of HCN, with its remarkable concentration of the leading figures of the new intelligentsia, was the nearest thing the New Culture Movement had to a headquarters. As indicated in the last chapter, the May Fourth Incident and the protest movement saw a shift to an emphasis on political activism in the work of the new intellectuals, and this change was to a certain extent also reflected in the pages of HCN in the years 1919 and 1920. This eclipse of intellectual, literary and cultural matters, together with the concomitant development of an interest in socialism which later turned into a commitment to Marxism, split the ranks of the united front of new intellectuals. Of the prominent members of the magazine, only Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao stayed on after 1920 to write for it.

Unfortunately, there are no figures available to show whether there was any real decline in HCN's circulation after 1920. But it is interesting that even the noted figures of Chinese communism, such as Mao Tse-tung and Mao Tun, spoke only of HCN's influence on them in the 1915-1918 years. (see Chapter 2, Section 7). At the same time, Chinese Communist historians of today, while they obviously approve more readily of HCN's editorial line in the 1921-26 period, tend much more to dwell on a discussion of HCN in the earlier period.(96)

After HCN had come under the effective control of the Shanghai Communist group in May 1920, some of its existing readership, like some of its editors, might also have demonstrated their disagreement with the change in editorial policy by discontinuing their support for the magazine. It was not an uncommon phenomenon at the time for the various leading new intellectuals to have their own respective

circles of intellectual admirers. For HCN, this loss might have been compensated to a certain extent by what might be called a "credibility reserve" which the magazine had built up with its readers by being the accepted leading periodical in the previous years.

At the same time, following the establishment of the CCP, HCN became more institutionalised in the sense that it was now the official publication of a political party, a relationship that the magazine itself had spoken up against in its early years. Part of its previous appeal as a publication in which "a hundred schools of thought contend", was no longer there. Moreover, even though the influence of the CCP spread rapidly among the urban workers in the early 1920s, HCN, by its designation as the party's theoretical journal, was that much more removed from them. It was the party's other publications such as Guide Weekly, The Pioneer, Vanguard and the numerous periodicals which were run by the various local Communist groups and designed specifically to appeal to the urban workers - that were closer to the people, and recruited more concrete support for the party than the theoretical HCN. It was perhaps not a mere coincidence that the active members of HCN in this period were all basically intellectuals rather than political organisers: men such as Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, Li Ta and Mao Tun (See Appendix A for biographical notes on them and others.) At the same time, those in the party who were, or who were to be noted for their organisational and political abilities - such as Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh, Liu Shao-ch'i and Chang Kuo-t'ao - contributed virtually nothing to the magazine.

We have seen that, as a Marxist periodical, HCN seeked to promote Marxism in China in three ways: discussion of Marxist principles and how these were related to the Chinese revolution; coverage of the Chinese situation, with its emphasis on general theoretical analyses rather than detailed factual reports; and finally its reportage of developments abroad especially in Russia.

(We shall also see in the following chapter another aspect of its work in this period: its debate with non-Marxist ideas, especially with other variants of socialism.) In all this work, the articles in HCN reflected the thinking of the early Chinese Communists. They believed that China as a nation was part of the world's proletariat, and that the national movement in China would be in the main the work of the urban workers, with the peasantry possibly playing only a supporting role. Thus, unlike its pre-Marxist form, HCN in the 1921-1926 period was not an initiator or promoter of new ideas. Even within the context of the Chinese Communist movement, new ideas or approaches were more often initiated in other quarters, such as the Central Committee which was much closer to the reality of the struggle than were the somewhat theoretical discussions in the magazine. But at the same time, the magazine was a venue where the party leaders could offer ideological explanations of their actions.

Li Lung-mu summarises the work of HCN in the 1923-26 years as follows.

> All in all, the quarterly and irregular issues of HCN were published in the middle period of the party's infancy. At the time, under the guidance of the correct line of the party, there were very great developments and victories in the revolutionary movement. The HCN of this time took up the tradition of struggle of the "May Fourth" period, and it also became a purely Marxist-Leninist periodical, as well as one of the first official theoretical journals of the party. It propagated the party's line and strategy in a period when the revolution was rapidly developing. It not only explained thoroughly the policy of the united front, but also conscientiously introduced the writings of Marx and Lenin as well as the experience of the international workers' movement. It also achieved great results in its thorough critique of the reactionary pragmatist philosophy. However, it should be pointed out that the party at the time was still an infant party, and so it was inevitable that HCN, in its propaganda work, was still imbued with viewpoints that were either unclear or even incorrect.(97)

This remark by Li on HCN in its Marxist phase is similar to the one that he makes on the work of the magazine in its New Culture phase, that is, although there were ideological shortcomings in the editorial

contents of HCN, the magazine contributed towards the establishment and spread of Marxism in China. Of course, Li's remark on this final phase of HCN is also influenced by the party's view on the early years of the CCP.

In the above summary by Li, mention is made of HCN's attack on pragmatism. This aspect of the magazine's work of a struggle against non-Marxist ideas could perhaps be considered as HCN's most effective contribution to the party's propaganda work, since, given its designation as a theoretical journal, it did not concentrate on dealing with the concrete situation. It is the debates between Marxism and other ideologies that we shall examine in the next Chapter.

CHAPTER 5. THE END OF THE UNITED FRONT OF NEW INTELLECTUALS: THE CONTENTION BETWEEN MARXISM & OTHER IDEAS IN THE 1920s.

In this chapter, a general description will first be given of the political attitudes among Chinese new intellectuals in the post-May Fourth period. Attention will then turn to the political stance of the outspoken group of liberal intellectuals, of whom Hu Shih was the foremost, and their political skirmishes with the Chinese Communists. There will also be an examination of HCN's work in criticising the ideas of various non-communist new intellectuals in the 1921 - 1926 period.

There are two reasons why attention is first to be given to the divergence between the liberals and the Marxists. In the first place, the split between them on HCN in 1920 can be said to be the single most important event in the history of the magazine, and it is appropriate that we should deal with the relationship between the two during the remaining years of HCN's existence. In the second place and in the context of the ideological tendencies of the May Fourth period, liberalism and Marxism may well be taken as the two most striking intellectual currents. In its broadest sense, liberalism was the hero of the New Culture Movement. In the years following 1919, however, liberalism gradually lost ground politically to socialist ideas, and it was the Marxism born of the May Fourth years that was eventually to transform the Chinese nation. Moreover, in the spectrum of ideas among the new intellectuals in the post-May Fourth years, liberalism and Marxism might conveniently be taken as its two opposite poles. Such a postulation is shared by the Chinese Communist historiography of May Fourth, in which "the struggle between the two lines" is identified as the struggle between liberalism and Marxism.

1. The General Disposition of Ideas Among the New Intellectuals in the early 1920s.

As described in Chapter 3 Section 4, the events arising out of the Versailles Conference brought on a general disillusionment with the West among China's new intellectuals, and such an attitude was a contributory factor in the acceptance of ideas that were critical of Western capitalist societies. The propensity towards socialist ideas, including Marxism, was further bolstered by the desire to make the Chinese nation strong by the most efficient way. At the same time, there were those among the new intellectuals, such as Chang Tung-sun, the guild socialist and admirer of Russell, who believed that socialism, though a noble end in itself, could not be achieved in China until her industrial development had reached a mature state, and that capitalism should be promoted in the interim period since it was the fastest way to industrialisation. Among the new intellectuals, such an idea attracted brief attention during 1921, coinciding with Russell's visit to China.(1)

Of much more interest to the new intellectuals was the proliferation of socialist ideas that came into vogue at the time, as we shall see in a following section that deals with HCN's debates with various non-Marxist ideologies. As for the Kuomintang, the decade of the 1920s was to see its ascendance. The "Three People's Principles" of nationalism, democracy and livelihood of Sun Yat-sen, who died in 1925, became official KMT ideology. Its operative expression was that the country's reunification and the national movement should first be carried out before all else.

Indeed, in the post-1919 years, it would be somewhat misleading to refer to the "new intellectuals" as one homogeneous group. The new political situation, or rather a change in the perception of the

national situation on the part of many new intellectuals, made it most difficult to continue with the pre-1919 alliance of a concerted opposition to conservative forces. Imperialism was now regarded by many to be at least as great a threat to the Chinese nation as the old feudal elements and the warlords. The split in the ranks of HCN intellectuals in 1920 was but the trailer of an increasingly apparent divergence among Chinese intellectuals over the vital question of what was to be the best course of action for the transformation of China. An event in the early 1920s that illustrated such a development was the split that took place in the Young China Association.

Established in June 1918, the Association was then a grouping of new intellectuals, virtually all of whom were later to become prominent figures in their respective fields. One of its rules was that members were not to participate in political activities. Such a requirement, though generally acceptable in the years of the New Culture Movement, became a matter of great contention among the members in the post-1919 years. For example, by 1921, members of its left wing, such as Li Ta-chao, Teng Chung-hsia, Chou Fo-hai and Mao Tse-tung, had already become members of the Communist Party. Indeed, the influence of socialist ideas was such at the time that a conference in 1921 called by the association to resolve the question of political activism, in effect discussed whether the Association should become a socialist organisation. This conference, as with another held in the following year, failed to resolve the question of political commitment. In October 1923, a nine-point program was adopted at yet another conference, and this embodied the call for anti-imperialism, anti-warlordism, and political and economic reforms. But this compromise solution between the left and right wings did not last, and the absence of an agreement over a common course of action

effectively meant that the Association ceased to function after 1924.(2)

This crystallisation into groups of varying political persuation was also reflected in the developments in the literary world. Ch'en Tu-hsiu for one, a champion of literary reforms in the 1915 - 1918 years, had from as early as 1919 forsaken his literary interest for political activity.(3) In 1921, Chou Tso-jen and Mao Tun initiated the Society for Literary Studies (Wen-hsüeh yen-chiu hui 文學研究會) which advocated a "literature of humanity". In its Manifesto, published in the January 1912 issue of HCN, the founding members of the Society asserted that "The time is now past when literature was only either a game for amusement or a pastime for venting sorrow. We believe that literature is a kind of labour, furthermore, it is a labour that is very significant to life."(4) The summer of the same year saw the establishment of another literary society with a professed aim that was clearly a reaction to the realistic literature of the first group. This was the Creation Society (Ch'uang-tsao she 創造社), in which its leading members, such as Kuo Mo-jo, Yü Ta-fu 郁達夫 and T'ien Han 田漢 , emphasised romanticism and individualism in literature, and believed that literature should be for literature's sake and the expression of the writer's individual emotions.(5) The basis of the literary contention between these two societies was in itself a capsule comment on the post-1919 movement: now that the old literature had been struck down, what kind of new literature should be created ?

The literary world in the 1920s was deeply affected by the course of political events. The May 30th Movement of 1925 changed the direction of both these societies. Lu Hsün and Chou Tso-jen left the Society for Literary Studies, and went to establish the Thread-of-Talk Society (Yü-ssu she 語絲社) which emphasised realism and humanitarianism. Later in 1930 Lu Hsün took up the leadership

of the League of Left-Wing Writers (Tso-i tso-chia lien-meng 左翼作家聯盟), which was to dominate the Chinese literary scene in the 1930s. As for the moderates, such as Hu Shih, Hsü Chih-mo 徐志摩 and Wen I-to 聞一多 , they established the Crescent Moon Society (Hsin-yüeh she 新月社) which in the 1920s essentially emphasised romanticism in literature, with little interest in politics.(6) The impact of the May 30th Movement was even more dramatic on the Creation Society. According to his own testimony, Kuo Mo-jo now turned his attention to social questions, and he later described the conflict that developed between himself and Yü Ta-fu as like that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. (7)

The split and then collapse of the Young China Association, and the divisive developments in the literary world, both illustrated the changes in political attitude that had taken place among the new intellectuals. The pre-1919 common denominator of a cultural transformation was now but a memory of the recent past. There were attempts at a new compromise, as in the Young China Association, but these soon gave way to a hardening of the respective attitudes of the various groups. The Chinese Communist Party was organised in 1921, and this was soon followed by the emergence of a group of liberal intellectuals who espoused an alternative course for the country. Since the unofficial leader of the liberals, Hu Shih, as well as the leaders of the CCP, both sprang from what had been the HCN group of intellectuals, we will now turn our attention to the political proposals of Chinese liberalism in these years, and the conflict that developed between Hu Shih and his former colleagues on HCN.

2. The Political Debates Between the Liberals and the Marxists.

As we saw in Chapter 3 section 12, in the dispute among the HCN group in late 1920 over whether the editorial office of the magazine should be moved back to Peking from Shanghai (and thus out of the control of the Shanghai Communist group and Ch'en Tu-hsiu who had gained effective control earlier on in May), Hu Shih had already assumed the role of spokesman for the liberals on HCN. Following the raid on the magazine's Shanghai office by the French Concession police and the move of the magazine to Canton, where the Marxists were able to exercise full control on the editorial direction of the magazine, Hu Shih and the other liberal intellectuals disassociated themselves from it.

In May the following year, Hu Shih, Kao I-han, T'ao Li-kung (who had all been important figures on HCN) and Ting Wen-chiang 丁文江 founded Endeavour Weekly (Nu-li chou-pao 努力週報) in Peking as an outlet for their ideas. Ting was a returned student from Britain, and according to Hu's later testimony, it was mainly due to his insistence that Endeavour Weekly was not the purely scholarly journal of literature and philosophy that Hu had originally intended it to be. Ting rejected Hu's idea that political involvement would be unproductive, and was critical of the emphasis that the latter placed on thought and literature. (8) It could well be due to Ting's insistence that Hu first began to write articles of a political nature during the two years of publication of the magazine in 1922 and 1923. At the same time, Hu pointed out in June 1922 that he was only doing so most reluctantly. In an article entitled "My precipitous path", published in Endeavour Weekly and later to

be frequently quoted by Chinese Communist historians as evidence of his reactionary thought, Hu explained that he had been provoked into discussing politics by two developments. The first was the corrupt state of the nation's politics, but the much more important one was the development in the previous several years of a trend among a large number of new intellectuals who spoke "emptily" of such grand ideas as Marxism and guild socialism, while giving hardly any attention to the actual problems of the country. Hu then made it clear that although he was now discussing politics, he still believed in the position he took up in the "Problems & Isms" polemics he exchanged with Li Ta-chao in the summer of 1919.

> "My discussion of politics at present is but putting into action my advocacy that we should have "More study of problems, and less talk of isms". ..... My discussion of politics is but putting into action my pragmatism, just as my discussion of vernacular literature is but putting into action my pragmatism. ..... Pragmatism puts the emphasis on specific realities and problems, and it does not recognise any fundamental solution. It recognises only progress that has been attained by dots and drops. Each step is guided by wisdom, and each step contains within it voluntary experiment. Only this is true evolution.(9)

Thus Hu's explanation of his venture into political discussion was that he was primarily concerned with the methodology of such discussion at the time. He saw himself as what he would like to see the other intellectuals become, an objective commentator of the political scene who was unhampered by doctrinaire ideologies. But the political sentiment of the radicals was such at the time that they no longer took issue with Hu Shih over his pragmatic approach, but were directly critical of his specific comments and proposals. In the following account of the polemics between the liberals and the Communists, one sees that they were equally concerned with specific problems and political issues, but that it was the difference in their

respective ideologies which underlined their positions over such issues, and which formed the basis of their contention.

The first important clash between the liberals and the Communists came not long after the establishment of Endeavour Weekly. In the very first issue of the magazine, published in May 1922, Hu Shih, Kao I-han, Ting Wen-chiang, Chang Wei-t'au, Tao Li-kung, Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei and nine other liberal education leaders published a document entitled, "Our political proposals". (Another signatory was Li Ta-chao, whose "propensity for 'united front' type activities" was discussed in Chapter 3 Section 12.) The liberals first asserted that if one was to discuss the political situation in China, then the first thing to do was to set forth a clear-cut objective for political action. The liberals believed this objective ought to be the establishment of a "good government", and appealed to the other political groups to share in this objective so that there would be a common course of action.(10) Then the liberals proceeded to define what they meant by a "good government" and how this could be achieved. They called for the country's reunification, the establishment of a parliamentary institution, the drafting of a constitution that would safeguard the freedom of the individual, and the establishment of a civil service system that would be both efficient and accountable to the public. (11)

The basic assumption in "Our political proposals" was not unlike that in the promotion of "Mr. Democracy" in the years of the New Culture Movement. There was the continued admiration for Western parliamentary democracy, and the assumption that an important aspect of political action, which was to be as important as concrete political action, was the propagation of the democratic values that underlined the proposed institutions. The difference with the earlier years was that now the proposals were much more specific, and put forward in a much stronger tone and in the immediate context of the Chinese

political action.

However, the liberals' very action of publishing "Our Political Proposals" also highlighted their political impotence and the fact that they lacked any political organisation, and could in reality wield little political power. Most of the liberal education leaders who signed the document were themselves reluctant to take up active political involvement. As one reader of Endeavour Weekly pointed out, what they lacked was a "Good Government Party".(12) Later in 1922, three of the signatories did join the Peking government at Tu P'ei -fu's invitation, but they soon lost their positions when the other warlords objected.(13)

The reaction of the CCP to the liberals' proposals was not unexpected. Part of the "First manifesto of the CCP on the current situation", published on June 10th, 1922, just prior to the Second Congress, made a direct and scathing attack on "Our political proposals".

> "This bourgeois reformism, this opportunist policy, this broken line of compromises is indeed an obstacle to giving life to your own lofty slogans and cries of 'struggle', 'endeavour', 'combat the sons of evils'. ..... Do you really believe that a 'good government' can be organised under existing conditions?(14)

As for the CCP's own political proposal, the line adopted at the Second Congress called for the consummation of the national-democratic revolution by a joint effort on the part of the proletariat, the peasantry, and the national and petty bourgeoisie.

The contention between the liberals and the Communists over the former's "Our political proposals" set the scene for the debates which followed. This first debate revealed the extent of the gap that had developed between the two sides. Not only did they differ fundamentally on the form of the political struggle and its aim, but they also had different conceptions of the Chinese reality. The gulf between the two sides was best illustrated by their debates

over two questions that were foremost in the minds of the political activists at the time - warlordism and imperialism.

In September 1922, Hu Shih published in Endeavour Weekly an article entitled, " A federation of self-governing provinces and warlord separatism". In it, he argued that the reason for the existence of warlordism in China was that regional forces in a genuinely large and diverse country were standing up against a unity that had been artificially imposed and maintained by force. Thus he was against the proposal by many at the time for a unitary system of government for the country. In its place, Hu suggested a federal system in which the provinces would have a large degree of autonomy, so that, when the regional characteristics were given room to develop, warlordism would be overwhelmed.(15)

The publication of Hu's article coincided with the first issue of Guide Weekly, in which Ch'en Tu-hsiu was not slow to refute the argument of his former colleague. He urged his countrymen not to follow the proposal of "some book-worms who had the superstitious belief that a constitution was some sort of magical panacea".(16) Ch'en's criticism that it was dangerous to propose a federal system at a time when the influences of the warlords were still pervasive, turned out to be more realistic. Hu's federalist proposal received scant support, except, not surprisingly, from the warlords themselves, and the debate soon faded away.(17)

On the question of imperialism, the gap between the positions of the liberals and the Communists was all the more striking. In the manifesto of its Second Congress, the CCP declared that one of its most important objectives was "the removal of oppression by international imperialism and the establishment of complete independence of the Chinese nation". (18) Hu Shih, on the other hand, considered the foreign presence in China in a much more favourable light. Writing in October 1922, a few months after the CCP's Second

Congress, he refuted the Communists' idea, and for that matter the idea of many patriotic activists, that there was any great danger of foreign aggression in China. Indeed, Hu's argument was that if there really was a threat from foreign imperialism, it was only because the imperialists were seeking to protect their own interests in a country that was as unstable as China. He concluded that if a democratic system was to be established in China, then there would be no more danger from foreign imperialism.(19)

Thus, there was quite an irreconcilable gap between the positions of the liberals and the Communists over what were perhaps the two most important questions of the day. On the first question of warlordism, both sides agreed only to the extent that warlordism was a real obstacle to any change in the Chinese situation, but from this initial premise the two sides drew entirely different conclusions as to how the problem was to be dealt with. On the second question of imperialism, they were even further apart. The liberals did not recognise the existence of an imperialist encroachment on China, whereas the Communists firmly believed that imperialism was the greatest enemy facing the Chinese nation.

It is quite evident that, apart from their political weakness in lacking any organisational backing, Hu Shih and the other liberal intellectuals did seriously misjudge the general political sentiment of the time, if not also the political situation itself. For example, not many people, with perhaps the exception of the Communists, would take exception to the political objective the liberals put forward in "Our political proposals": after all, the idea of constitutional democracy had long been put forward since the days of the New Culture Movement. But after years of political chaos, the real question in many people's minds was how such an objective could be achieved. Again, many believed that warlordism was one of the greatest obstacles barring the way to a new China, and for Hu Shih to suggest federalism

in such a situation was, at the very least, inopportune. Finally, on the question of imperialism, though some might not share the Communists' view of an imperialist monster, the previous view of the West as a benevolent friend extending a helping hand to a prostrate China had long been buried in the events arising out of Versailles. The general view of the West in the post-May 4th era was much more cynical or realistic than that put forward by Hu Shih, and many Chinese patriots regarded the West more as a self-seeking opportunist than a well-intentioned friend.

In May 1923, Hu's health failed him, and on a year's leave from Peita, he retired to the countryside to rest. Endeavour Weekly was left in the hands of Ting Wen-chiang, T'ao Li-kung, Kao I-han and Chang Wei-tz'u. In October, Hu wrote to them to express his view of his excursion into political commentary and of his idea of what Endeavour Weekly should be henceforth. He remarked that their involvement in politics had proved to be futile, that "it should not be our intention to present any lucid and well-reasoned appeal to bandits". He went on to say that their purpose would be much better served if they were to reorganise Endeavour Weekly into a journal that would continue with the unfulfilled enterprise of HCN, which was to lay a foundation in literature and thought for future politics.(20) But the journal ceased publication in 1923, and so ended Hu Shih's first involvement in political activities.

In today's Chinese Communist historiography, Hu Shih is vilified as an agent of American "cultural imperialism", and the considerable, though not leading, role he played in the literary revolution in the New Culture Movement is at best down-graded, and at worst regarded as part of "his attempt to lead bourgeois Westernisation" to the

Chinese people.(21) On the political front, he is accused of the attacks he made on Marxism, dating from the "Problems & Isms" debate in the summer of 1919, as well as of his "collaboration" with both the reactionary elements in Chinese society and foreign imperialists.(22) As for his pragmatist philosophy, it is described as a rationale for both imperialist aggression and reformism in Chinese society.(23)

Such Chinese Communist attacks on Hu Shih reached a peak only in the mid-1950s, several years after he had left China for the United States in April 1949.(24) It seems that the attacks have been not so much directed against his political activities, which were relatively limited and unsuccessful, as against the brand of Western-leaning, sceptical and elitist intellectualism of which he was such a representative figure. In the words of Chang Ch'in-nan, writing in 1955,

> Of course, many of the intellectuals who had believed in Hu Shih later saw through his reactionary political face, and have long since parted ways with him in politics. But the influence of both the thought of Hu Shih, and of the bourgeois idealist thought of which he was representative, has continued to live under the surface in some of our intellectuals.(25)

3. HCW's Debate with "Various Deviant Sects of Social Thoughts".

In HCW's New Manifesto published in the first quarterly number in June 1923, one of the aims of the magazine was declared to be "the defence of the truth that is to transform society, and hence HCW should criticise the various deviant sects of social thoughts".(26) The magazine had of course been engaged in such an effort since it came under the effective control of the Marxist intellectuals in May 1920. The reason the account of this aspect of HCW's work is being given in this chapter and not the last is that it would add to the description of the breakup of the united front of the new intellectuals and the dissection of the various ideas in this period.

Another notable development which the following account illustrates is that from 1921 onwards, the magazine expended no effort in a criticism of Chinese traditionalism or the conservative forces. In this sense, the post-1921 debates illustrated the qualitative change in the work of the Chinese radical intelligentsia, i.e., the emphasis was now on what sort of new China was to take the place of the old, and how this was to be achieved.

In the 1921-1926 period, HCH's first important debate was with the guild socialists and others who were putting forward the idea that China must go through an interim period of capitalistic development before she could implement socialism. This debate had really started at the end of 1920 when Russell began his visit to China and put forward his view on Chinese development. (See Chapter 3 Section 10.) In February 1921, Construction (Chien-she 建設) the organ of the Progress Party, started a 'Studies of Socialism' column which soon became the forum for the ideas of the leading supporters of Russell such as Chang Tung-sun and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao.(27)

In May 1921, HCH published an article by Li Ta, which was a detailed rebuttal of an article published by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao in Construction. Li made five basic criticisms of Liang's proposal that China should adopt capitalism as a method for the development of her economy. Firstly, capitalism would bring to China all the social evils that the industrial revolution had created in the West. Liang had suggested that such evils could be eradicated by "a movement that both encourages production and ensures an equitable distribution of wealth", but Li rejected such an idea and belittled it as nothing but "Bernstein's socialism".(28) Secondly, capitalistic development of the Chinese economy in the existing situation would only mean that the native industry would become an appendage and come under the control of foreign imperialism. Thirdly, because of

the powerful grip of foreign imperialism, even if native capitalism should be possible, it would take such a long period to become effective that the Chinese people would continue to suffer great hardships in the interim period.(29) Fourthly, the reformism that was implicit in Liang's programme would mean the continual existence of free competition and private property, which Li believed to be the two fundamental evils that would eventually breed capitalism and militarism.(30) Fifthly, Li rejected completely Liang's suggestion that socialism could eventually be introduced in China by parliamentary methods and a reformist labour movement.(31)

The debate with the guild socialists lasted well into 1922, and it was also taken up by Pioneer, the organ of the CCP's Socialist Youth Corps. Apart from Li Ta, the main contributor on the Communists' side was a "Hsin K'ai" 新凱 , who, in an article published in HCH in July 1922, discussed the fundamental difference between Marxism and guild socialism.

> We propose that we should first arm those who labour, since they are the suffering majority in the existing social system. With their power and their armed might, we can then disarm the rulers in the existing society. This means that we should first overthrow the existing government, armies, newspapers and schools. ..... We believe that socialism can only be achieved by revolution, and so we regard revolution with the utmost importance. Those who are against revolution are against socialism, and what they propose is not socialism. ..... Guild socialism .... proposes that we beg for the kindness of the capitalists, and that a violent revolution is not necessary. ..... Let's leave aside the question of whether this "beggar-type" of class struggle is contemptible or not, let's just say that it is unfeasible. The existing ruling class have the upper-hand at present, so why should they back up when you ask them to concede. (32)

In this attack on the guild socialists, Li and Hsin K'ai were further supported by Mao Tse-tung and Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai. The former was particularly forthright in his criticism of the Chinese guild socialists, describing them as being "either cowards who really want to advocate capitalism but are afraid to do so openly, or hypocrites

who are deceiving both themselves and others".(33) As for Ch'ü, his contribution to the debate was published in HCN in June 1923, and it was the last article on the subject published in the magazine. Ch'ü's article was a critique of an article by Russell published in a Peking newspaper a year earlier. Russell had argued that the class struggle, especially if it should be waged on an international level, would effectively mean the end of civilisation. Ch'ü's reply was that the existing situation already meant the sacrifice of many people for the sake of the capitalists. The answer lay in socialism, the effective implementation of which, given the nature of the class society, necessarily meant the forcible seizure of power by the proletariat.(34)

In the context of the spread of Marxism in China, this debate in 1921 and 1922 between the Communists and guild socialists is of considerable historical interest. Unlike the liberals, who, as we have seen, lacked both a political organisation and a grasp of the prevailing political sentiment of the time, the guild socialists had a degree of backing from the Progress Party and the Study Clique. In advocating economic development, they shared in a widespread belief in the post-1919 period that China should be in a position to protect herself in future. In putting forward the idea that capitalism, although it was not to be the objective, would be the most efficient method for development, the guild socialists were in tune with the general feeling at the time that China should avoid the social evils and militarist dangers inherent in Western capitalism. Moreover, to those at the time who were unfamiliar with the difference between Marxism and guild socialism, it might appear that there was little difference between the two, or that the latter seemed to offer a kind of shortcut to a new China. Therefore it was not surprising that the Communists viewed the guild socialists as a rival political

group, of the centre, but left of the liberals, which was trying to draw support from the same patriotic group as they were. In this context and the early years of the CCP, this debate with the guild socialists was an important event. In today's Chinese Communist historiography of May Fourth, this debate is described as the second debate between Marxism and anti-Marxist ideologies of the period, the first being the "Problems & Isms" debate in 1919. Its positive effect is described as "exposing the class nature of the Study Clique elements and their service to imperialism, feudalism and the comprador bourgeoisie." The debate is also credited with "a further affirmation of the viewpoint that Marxism-Leninism must be propagated in China, and that socialism must be implemented in China."(35)

The other important debate with the left that the HCN had was with the anarchists. Anarchism had been of considerable influence among the Chinese radical intelligentsia in the first decade of the Twentieth Century, and since that time it had continued to be an intellectual current of some influence.(36) HCN's attack on the anarchists in the 1921-1926 period was largely lead by Ch'en Tu-hsiu. His criticisms were levelled at two groups of anarchists: the individual anarchists of the nihilist variety, and the Chinese followers of Kropotkin.

It was against the first group that Ch'en was the much more critical. Their leader was Chu Ch'ien-chih 朱謙之, who founded the Society for the Study of Anarchism, following the split in the broadly-based Society for the Study of Socialism at Peking University. In a contribution to the "Random Thoughts" column in HCN in May 1921, Ch'en first spoke of the necessity for the establishment of a "benevolent dictatorship" in China, but then he considered the "nihilism and irresponsibility in the thoughts of Lao

Tzu and Chuang Tzu" as the greatest barrier to the implementation and acceptance of this dictatorship.

> The anarchism which has recently gained some popularity among the young is not the anarchism of the West. I have always maintained that it is the resurrection of the pre-existing ideas of Lao and Chuang. It is the Chinese variety of anarchism. ..... I have the greatest hatred for the nihilism and irresponsibility in the thoughts of Lao and Chuang, and consider them to be the greatest poison facing the young. (37)

While Ch'en's criticism of the individual anarchists was virulent, it was with the Kropotkin anarchists, under the leadership of Ou Sheng-pai 區聲白 , that he had the more serious debate. An exchange of letters between Ch'en and Ou was reprinted in the August 1921 number of HCN. Ou agreed with Ch'en on the necessity of the class struggle and revolutionary action for changing society, but disagreed with him fundamentally on the organisational form of the new society. He believed that any individuals who would not agree with the new society should be given the opportunity to opt out, and that there should not be any repressive laws to punish any non-conformism.(38) Ch'en's reply was that not only was it impossible for any individual to opt out completely from any society, but also that it was essential to the maintenance of the proletarian dictatorship that class enemies be punished.(39)

Ch'en's position towards Ou and the Kropotkin anarchists was an ambiguous one. He did not so much regard them as political enemies, as he did the liberals and the guild socialists, but as a group whose ideological position he regarded as close enough to his own to warrant an attempt to win them over.(40) To the modern Chinese Communist historian, this attitude of Ch'en of regarding the anarchists as being within the socialist camp, is yet another example of his political opportunism.(41)

Ch'en was later also criticised for the part he played in the "Science & View of Life" debate. This debate was initiated in early 1923, and it was at this stage a contention between two groups of non-Marxist intellectuals. The first group, headed by Carsun Chang (Chang Chün-mai 張君勱) and supported by Chang Tung-sun and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, argued that whatever the state of scientific development was and would be, only human ideas and intuition could form the basis of a philosophy of life. On the other hand, the other group, headed by Ting Wen-chiang, and supported by Hu Shih, Wang Hsing-kung and Wu Chih-hui, argued that it was essential to apply the scientific method to the analysis of human problems.

The debate between these two groups lasted for the greater part of 1923, during which Ch'en Tu-hsiu and the other Marxist intellectuals did not take part. At the end of the year, several of the more important essays in the debates were collected in a volume, for which both Hu Shih and Ch'en Tu-hsiu were asked to contribute a preface, and it was the publication of this anthology that sparked off a philosophical debate between the liberals and the Marxists.

Ch'en's criticism of Ting and Hu was essentially a criticism of their pragmatist philosophy. Arguing from the standpoint of historical materialism, he asserted that it was objective economic conditions that not only held the explanation to history, but also determined a person's philosophy of life.(42) Hu's reply was that although he believed that economic factors were important, intellectual factors, such as knowledge and thought, were just as important in the explanation of history.(43) In response, Ch'en cited the literary revolution of a few years past as an example of a historical change which had been brought about

more by objective economic conditions than the contributions of individuals. He saw the literary movement at that time more as the consequence of industrial development and population concentration than as the result of the effort of such people as himself and Hu Shih.(44)

The attack on Hu Shih and the pragmatic philosophy was also joined by Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai and Chiang Kuang-ch'ih 蔣光赤 . Writing in the August 1924 issue of HCN, Ch'ü described the appearance in China at the time of the pragmatist philosophy itself as an inevitable consequence of objective conditions.

> In China, where international imperialism has eaten its way into and shaken the feudal society, there is the demand for a new world-view and a new view of life to suit the new situation. The positive aspect of the pragmatist philosophy just fulfils this need. ..... When it is applied in China, it constitutes an excellent method of revolution for the bourgeoisie: Don't bother with the social conventions and the classical teachings, just go ahead and develop yourself. But the meaning of its message to the labouring class is that they should not bother with socialism: it's all right as long as you can deal with the immediate problems facing you.(45)

As for Chiang Kuang-ch'ih, his criticism of Hu was much more personal. In a short piece published in HCN in May 1926, he first sarcastically identified Hu Shih as "that lively figure of modernization of six or seven years ago", but then he went on to say:

> As each year went by, Hu Shih-chih kept standing at the same spot. He's hardly moved an inch; maybe even he is daily gradually developing a tendency of moving backward.(46)

The course of the "Science & View of Life" debate is an interesting comment on the divergence between the liberals and the Marxists. The debate had really started as a contention between the liberals and a group of moderate intellectuals, in which one would naturally regard the liberals, as they themselves

and their opponents did, as the group with the more modern, Western and scientific outlook. The disposition of forces in the initial period of the debate was then not unlike that in the New Culture Movement in which the new intellectuals were ranged against the conservative forces. But in the later course of this debate from the end of 1923 on, the liberals were themselves assailed by the Marxists who put themselves forward as the group with an even more "scientific" ideology. Moreover, the Marxists had of course grown out of the same earlier grouping of "new intellectuals" as the liberals.

The historical irony has been further added to by today's Chinese Communist historiography of the part played by Ch'en Tu-hsiu in the debate. He is criticised not only for his failure to recognise the pragmatism of Hu as "subjective idealism", but also for the fact that he himself was "deeply influenced" by the same ideology.(47) The credit for "thoroughly exposing the true nature of the sham-scientism and idealism in pragmatism" goes to Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, who, by doing so, "succeeded to and further developed the revolutionary legacy of the May Fourth Movement".(48)

Indeed, in the modern Chinese Communist view of the ideological history of this period, great significance is attached to the various struggles between Marxism and bourgeois ideologies. We have already noted the comments made by party historians on the struggles with the liberals, the guild socialists and the anarchists. The overall view of these struggles is that they not only expanded the influence of Marxism, but that they were also quite essential at the time.

> On the one hand, they (this series of debates) defeated the extremely shallow and ignorant non-sensical arguments of the bourgeois intellectuals, and on the other hand, they thoroughly demonstrated that the bourgeoisie no longer had the power to solve the real problems of China. Therefore, they further motivated the progressive elements in China to unite together Marxist theory and the reality of the Chinese revolution.(49)

An interesting historical footnote to the debates between Marxism and bourgeois ideologies is that in the last few years before his death in 1942, Ch'en Tu-hsiu came to reject the Marxism for which he had worked so actively in the 1920's. He wrote that, "having analysed thoroughly the experience of Soviet Russia in the last twenty years", he came to the conclusion that the proletarian dictatorship - "with the immense power wielded by the secret political police, the one-party system, the absence of factions within the party, the lack of freedom of publication, strike and election" - was bound to produce a dictatorial system.(50) He believed that all these dangers would be prevented in a parliamentary democracy, and further called for the destruction of "the three strongholds of reaction" in the world, which he identified as Soviet Russia, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy.(51)

4. Conclusion

While it may be somewhat of an exaggeration to say that the various bourgeois ideologies were defeated in the 1920's, it cannot be denied that the debates with them took place in a particularly crucial period for Chinese Marxism. As mentioned above, the progressive intellectuals now no longer levelled the brunt of their political polemics against the conservative elements in Chinese society, but at each other. The vulnerability of the conservative forces had been demonstrated by both the New Culture Movement and the May Fourth Incident. But the latter also pointed to the urgent necessity of establishing a new and strong China. The basis of the contention between the Communists and other progressive and radical groups was what form this new China was to take, and the methods by which the objective was to be achieved.

To the Communists, the debate with the liberals was perhaps the most straightforward, not only in the sense that the liberals' proposals were so obviously different from their own, but also in the sense that these proposals could well have been put forward by NCR in its liberal-bourgeois years. Moreover, as we have seen and will further expand on in the following chapter, the liberals largely failed to tap the general political sentiments of the time. However, the contention between these two groups is of historical significance in that both had grown out of the ideological milieu of the New Culture Movement, and had in fact collaborated in NCR.

As for the guild socialists, anarchists, and other non-Marxist socialists, they, like the Marxists, were products of the 1919-1920 years, sharing a common desire to make China strong and a common feeling of disenchantment, if not of bitterness and hatred, for the West. Thus, not only were the ideological positions of these groups closer to that of the Marxists, but also they were all seeking to exploit the same political sentiments. In this sense, the Marxists' debates with

these groups served to delineate their respective ideological positions, and in the process, consolidated the ideology of the CCP.

Therefore, though it is often difficult to judge which side is the victor in a "battle of words"(lun--chan 論戰), it is fair to say that the CCP emerged from these debates in the 1920's as a better-known, more established, and more well-defined political group.

CHAPTER 6. PERSPECTIVES ON THE MAY FOURTH MOVEMENT.

1. Introduction.

The methodological assumption in this thesis is that a detailed study of the HCN magazine provides an insight into the course of the May Fourth Movement, and, in particular, the changes in political attitudes of a historically significant group of Chinese intellectuals . As mentioned in the last chapter, liberalism can be regarded as the hero of the pre-1919 years of the May Fourth Movement, but it was Marxism, taking root in the post-1919 years, that eventually triumphed. HCN, in its eleven years of publication, was intimately involved in the fortunes of these two ideologies, first as the leading new periodical of the New Culture Movement, and then as an official organ of the early Chinese Communist Party. In this concluding chapter, the discussion will centre on two things: the significance of the May Fourth years in the history of the Chinese Communist Party, and the nature and failure of Chinese liberalism in this period. The text will conclude with an attempt to put forward a tentative perspective on the May Fourth Movement.

Chow Tse-tsung defines the period of the May Fourth Movement as roughly spanning the 1917-1921 years inclusive.(1) The period of publication of HCN lasted from September 1915 to July 1926, and thus more than spanned what has been generally accepted as the period of the movement, as well as the New Culture Movement which lasted roughly from late 1915 to 1919. In the discussion of the history of the magazine in the previous chapters, its period of publication has been divided into three phrases. This division reflects the changes in the editorial direction of the magazine, and indirectly, the changes in the course of the May Fourth Movement. The degree of efficacy in looking at the history of a period through the pages of a contemporary magazine,

albeit those of HCN — generally regarded both at that time and today as the most influential periodical of the period—will be discussed in section 4. But, for the purpose of the following discussion in this chapter, it might be appropriate to first summarise the three periods of HCN, which in turn can be shown to be not inaccurate reflections of the changes in the larger May Fourth Movement.

In the first period, from its founding in September 1915 by Ch'en Tu-hsiu to the months prior to the May Fourth Incident in 1919, the underlying assumption in the editorial policy of HCN was that the revitalisation of China lay in a cultural transformation. The HCN intellectuals saw their work in a struggle for man's minds. On the one hand, they launched an attack on the hold of traditionalism over the Chinese people, and on the other, they hoped to inject the liberal and democratic ideas of the West into the minds of their compatriots, in the belief that a strong China must have a democratic government, and that a democratic government must have a democratic-thinking people. During this period, the new intellectuals did not consider active political involvement as an appropriate course of action, since they believed that the politics of the time was mere in-fighting between various groups who in no way represented the people's interests.

The May Fourth protest in 1919 was a water-shed in the history of HCN, as it was in the struggle of the new intellectuals. The events arising out of Versailles generated a widespread disenchantment with the Western Powers, while the protest movement demonstrated the effectiveness of political action in the domestic political situation. The years 1919-1920 also saw an increasing interest in various socialist ideas, including Marxism, which was not only critical of the capitalist West, but at the same time offered a seemingly rapid means by which the Chinese nation would become

strong enough to defend herself. The growing political activism of this period brought to end the alliance of the new intellectuals. The split between the liberals and the Marxists on HCN was heralded by the "Problems & Isms" debate in the summer of 1919. By May 1920 the magazine had come under the effective control of one of China's first Communist groups, and it was in February 1921 that the liberals departed from the editorial board.

In its final period, from March 1921 to July 1926, HCN was one of several periodicals published by the Chinese Communist Party. In this period, the former united front of the New Culture Movement had disintegrated completely, and was replaced by a spectrum of political groups, ranging from the liberals to the Marxists, which contended between themselves over what was the best course of political action for the country.

2. CHINESE COMMUNISM & MAY FOURTH.

Chinese Communist historiography of today argues that the reason Marxism did not come to China earlier than it did was because the objective conditions in Chinese society were not ripe. While there is some truth in this observation, in that the spurt in the development of Chinese industry in the years of the First World War and the subsequent emergence of an urban proletariat later did help to bolster the faith of the early Marxists in the appropriateness of the ideas of Marx, an equally important reason was that those who took an early interest in socialism, from Kang Yu-wei and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, to Chiang K'ang-hu and Sun Yat-sen, only had a limited knowledge of socialism, and in general were prone to regard socialism as a means to prevent, rather than bring about, a social revolution. Thus, in a way, they considered socialism to be not immediately relevant to the Chinese situation, at least in so far as they believed that the

more important task at hand was constitutional reforms. In the words of Martin Bernal,

> Almost without exception, early champions of socialism insisted that there were no great economic injustices in Chinese society. Their concern with socialism and anarchism was because they saw them as ways to prevent the rise of the injustices and immoralities of impending capitalism.(2)

At the same time, Bernal comments that this early interest in socialism was not without its contribution, in that it first made familiar the vocabulary of socialism to the May Fourth generation of intellectuals who were to give a new reading to socialism (3)

It is the October revolution in Russia that is today credited by Chinese Communist historians for pointing out the Marxist way for China. In the words of Hung Huan-ch'un, "It was only after the October Revolution in Russia, that the truly revolutionary and truly scientific socialism -- Marxism-Leninism -- was introduced to China , and the thought of the Chinese people underwent a tremendous change". (4) The argument in Chinese Communist historiography on the contribution of the October Revolution to the Chinese revolutionary movement in this period may be summarised as follows. The ideological basis of the Bolsheviks, Marxism-Leninism, pointed out to some progressive intellectuals in China that the liberation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries laid in anti-imperialism, and that the power of the masses was a vital factor for success in this struggle.(5) This argument goes on to state that the impact of the October Revolution on some of the progressive Chinese intellectuals was so immediate and great that a qualitative change took place in the New Culture Movement.

> .....After the October Revolution, the New Culture Movement was a movement for cultural revolution which consisted of a united front of three groups of people --the Communist intellectuals, the revolutionary petty-bourgeois intellectuals and the bourgeois intellectuals. The Communist intellectuals were the leading forces in this movement, while the

> bourgeois intellectuals were its right wing. Therefore, there was a qualitative difference between the New Culture Movement of the period after the October Revolution, and the same movement in the period before the October Revolution when it was led by the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgoeisie. After the October Revolution, the New Culture Movement was a movement for cultural revolution that already had the characteristics of the new democracy.(6)

The question of whether the post-1917 May Fourth Movement was Communist-led will be dealt with later on, but the present point of discussion is whether, in the context of the origin of Marxism in China, the October Revolution had the great impact depicted in Chinese Communist historiography. While it is indisputable that the October Revolution played a part in the acceptance of Marxism in China, it is here contended that it did not play such a catalytic role as is, for example, suggested in the above passage. Rather, it was the turbulent events in China which followed the news from Versailles — with the concomitant tendencies of a greater political activism on the part of the new intellectuals, a widespread feeling of disenchantment with the West, and a new interest in socialist ideas — that paved the way for the acceptance of Marxism by a section of the new intelligentsia. There are several points which argue in favour of this interpretation, rather than the one which suggests that it was the October Revolution which implanted Marxism in China.

Firstly, Marxism was not an unknown quantity to the Chinese intellectuals prior to the October Revolution. The translation of various Marxist tracts began sporadically in the first decade of the twentieth century (See Chapter 2 Section 6). Coming to China mainly via Japan, Marxism did not attract the serious attention of the radical intellectuals, largely because they did not believe that it was relevant to Chinese society. This fact alone is not of course sufficient an argument against the suggestion that it was the October Revolution that "delivered" Marxism

to China, since one could well argue that what the October Revolution did was to indicate the relevance of Marxism to China. But it does suggest that Marxism was not a completely unknown quantity of "divine revelation" that the October Revolution dropped on China. One indication of this is that a great part of the Chinese socialist terminology in use today was originally translated from the Japanese. (7)

Secondly, and of greater importance, the Chinese new intellectuals, with the exception of Li Ta-chao, did not take a serious interest in socialist ideas in general until after the May Fourth Incident. In the period from the October Revolution to the May Fourth Incident, in the pages of HCN, for example, discussion of socialism was sporadic and was always only mentioned in passing. As we saw (in Chapter 2 Section 6), in this period, Li Ta-chao's interest in Marxism could only be considered as a side-current in the mainstream of political ideology of the New Culture Movement. Ch'en's conversion to Marxism did not come until the middle of 1920. (See Chapter 3 Section 9.) Even for Li, his initial attraction to the October Revolution was not so much based on the ideology of the Bolsheviks, but on their action and success in "turning over a new leaf in world history"; it was only by the end of 1919 that Li was free of his initial reservations about Marxism.

Thirdly, the news of the October Revolution did not create any great stir among new intellectuals, and was generally regarded as more of a republican revolution than a socialist one. During and at the end of the First World War, for example, the Chinese new intellectuals continued to look towards the democratic West as a model for new China. They had been enthusiastic supporters of the Allies' cause in the war, since they believed that an Allies' victory would be a positive contribution to the movement for democracy in the world, and news of the October Revolution was generally

interpreted in the same light. Then the decision concerning Shantung dashed their hopes in the Western powers, but a new-found nationalistic affinity with Russia was established by the news of the Karakhan Proposal which reached China in March 1920. In contrast to the scant reaction given to the news of the October Revolution, the Karakhan Proposal was met with a tremendous response of friendship from various sections in Chinese society. It was therefore only in the months following the May Fourth Incident that the Chinese new intellectuals began to take interest in the ideological base of the October Revolution. This development was of course bolstered by both the growing interest in socialist ideas and the new-found belief in the efficacy of mass action which was demonstrated in the protest movement.

Finally, even in the first two years of the Chinese Communist Party, it was the pre-Leninist variety of Marxism that the first Chinese Communists were primarily concerned with. For example, in the pages of HCN, as we saw in Chapter 4 Section 4, it was only from the second half of 1923 that there was any extensive discussion of Lenin's ideas and translations of various Leninist tracts. Therefore, it was pre-Leninist Marxism that first captured the attention of some of the new intellectuals, and not so much the ideas of Lenin which constituted the larger part of the active ideological base of the October Revolution. Even in the case of Li Ta-chao, the first to take interest in the October Revolution, his discussion of Marxism published in "My Marxist View" in May 1919 made virtually no mention of the ideas of Lenin. (See Chapter 3 Section 5.)

Therefore, it may be suggested that the impact of the October Revolution on the Chinese Communist movement was not an immediate one, in that it was not the ideology of the Bolsheviks that first turned the attention of Li Ta-chao and others to Marxism. Including perhaps even Li, it was the events in China in 1919 that first demonstrated to them the possible relevance of Marxism to China.

Of course, when the first Chinese intellectuals began to take a serious interest in Marxism in this period, the fact that the Bolsheviks had succeeded in their revolution was an inspirational example to them. One could also not deny the assistance given to Ch'en and Li by the Comintern in the setting up of the CCP, and the fact that the ideas of Lenin later provided them with a new insight into the plight of China. But these points do not challenge the postulation that it was the events in 1919,and not the October Revolution, that was the single most important factor in the process by which a section of China's new intellectuals became committed to Marxism.

The Chinese Communist Party was founded in July 1921, and within a few eventful years, it was already a real political force to be reckoned with. It was during these first years that the party acquired an organisational structure along Leninist lines, as well as the Leninist formula of a vanguard elite leading the masses. But perhaps the most striking of the party's concrete developments in this period was that it was largely the intellectuals and youths of the May Fourth generation who joined the party in its first years that were to lead the party through the years and right up to today. This fact is, of course, not without any ideological connotations.

According to Martin Wilbur, all ten of the people who discussed the idea of the formation of a communist party with Voitinsky were aged between twenty and forty. Again, of the 120 leading members of the party in early April 1927, the ages of 68 people can be determined, and 83% of the latter group were aged thirty-five or under. (8) As for the educational background of the 120 leading members, that of 88 of them is known. Of these, only eight had little or no education, while nearly half of them had studied abroad, mostly in Japan, France and Russia.(9) In 1960, Mao Tse-tung, in an interview with Edgar Snow, spoke of about 800 party members

that had survived through the years from Chiang Kai-shek's coup in 1927.

> By and large, Mao said, China was being run and for some years would be run by those 800. About one-fourth of the 800 were members or alternate members of the Central Committee. At the summit several dozens made up the Politburo and the Secretariat of the Party Central Committee until the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-1969), at the climax of which the Ninth Party Congress in 1969 elected a Central Committee and Politburo with sixteen new members, including many drawn from outside the '800'. (10)

Thus, a disproportionately large number of the CCP leaders through the years had joined the party in its first years. Virtually all of them, at the time they joined the party, were among the students or young intellectuals who had participated in the events of 1919. Although there are many differences between the party ideology of today and the Marxism that first attracted the attention of the first party-members, certain basic motivations and assumptions of the May Fourth era have survived strongly and influenced the development of the party.

The first question to be discussed is the formation of the party itself, or more specifically, to what extent was the party's formation a "historical inevitability", given the "objective" social conditions at the time, and to what extent it was the concrete crystallisation of the particular ideological predilections of the founding members. Chinese Communist historiography naturally subscribes to the first view. A characteristic passage reads as follows.

> By this time, the Chinese working class had already entered the political stage, and were exerting great influence. The propagation of Marxism-Leninism had not only begun in China, but it was also spreading widely. The union between the Chinese working class and Marxism-Leninism was inevitable. .....Therefore the birth of the Chinese Communist Party was an inevitable law in the development of modern Chinese history.(11)

It was true that a Chinese proletariat was not only in existence at this time, but also played its part in the May Fourth protest. But its participation was motivated less by socio-economic

reasons, let alone by Marxism, than by indignation over the treatment of China at Versailles. Again, although the workers' action must have indicated to some of the new intellectuals that the urban proletariat was a source of political power, this indication was but part of the wider revelation to these new intellectuals of the general efficacy of direct political action, as compared with the cultural-intellectual approach that they previously adopted. In other words, it would be difficult to speak of the existence of an irresistable proletarian groundswell at the time, and to credit to it the establishment of the Chinese Communist Party.

Thus, rather than suggesting the formation of the CCP as the culmination of a contemporary proletarian movement, it might be postulated that its founding members were motivated by other, less orthodox, reasons. The pre-Marxist writings of both Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao, for example, contained virtually no discussions of the Chinese workers. Rather, they were primarily concerned with the fate of Chinese society and the Chinese people as a whole. It was this nationalistic concern that first started them and others on a search for a way to transform China, initially adopting the democratic West as a model in the New Culture Movement. The events of 1919 turned them away from the West, while their struggle now included much greater political activism. But their basic motivation remained the same, and that was to revitalise Chinese society and make the country strong. It was in such a context that they came to embrace Marxism as the most efficient way of transforming Chinese society, and their concern and interest in the Chinese proletariat only followed from that.

Such a postulation of course does not deny the importance of socio-economic factors. The urban proletariat did provide the support on which the early Chinese Communist Party based itself,

even though, to paraphrase Benjamin Schwartz, it was Marxism that turned the attention of Li, Ch'en and others to the proletariat, rather than the proletariat that turned their attention to Marxism. (12) The nationalism of the May Fourth period also had its socio-economic roots in the Western imperialist presence in China. But of the two, the proletariat and nationalism, one is inclined to accept the latter as the much stronger motivation that led to the formation of the Chinese Communist Party. It was partly due to the nature of this initial motivation that Chinese Communists, from Li Ta-chao to Mao Tse-tung, were ready to interpret Marxism to fit in with the Chinese reality. In his admirable study of Li Ta-chao, Maurice Meisner comments on Li's and Mao's interpretation of Marxism.

> Those activistic and voluntaristic impulses were inspired by and also reinforced even more deeply rooted nationalistic impulses. For Mao, as well as for Li, the salvation and rebirth of the Chinese nation was the major concern, but it was to be a socialist rebirth, China's precapitalist social and economic structure notwithstanding, for China was not to be allowed to fall behind in the progressive march of history. It was to achieve this rebirth that both undertook to transform Marxist doctrine. (13)

Both Meisner and other writers have commented on the various ways in which Marxism was interpreted by Chinese Marxists from Li Ta-chao onwards. It seems that Li was not unaware of the "voluntaristic interpretations" he was lending to Marxism. In the "Problems & Isms" debate in the summer of 1919, he remarked that there were two aspects of theory and practice to every ism, and that when a theory was adapted to a political situation, there were bound to be differences due to time, place, and other conditions. Li concluded that if any ism was utilised in a practical movement, it would change and adapt to the particular environment. (14)

For Li and others, including the contributors to HCN in its Marxist phase, the most urgent task at hand was the rapid transformation of the deplorable state of the country, and although

Marxism was to be their overall guideline in their revolutionary enterprise, they were disinclined to be rigidly bound to any Marxist tenet that seemed to them to be restrictive in any way. Both Meisner and Schram have commented on the particular ideological predilections that Li had passed on to Mao, and, to varying degrees, these traits were also evident in the Chinese Marxists of the May Fourth era who were to play such a leading part in the party's history. Such traits included an almost boundless faith in the ability of conscious, human endeavour to overcome the supposed limitations of "objective conditions".(15) Yet another notion shared by the May Fourth generation of Chinese Marxists, which owned its conception certainly not to Marxism but to the nationalism of the period, was that the Chinese nation was a "proletarian" nation under the threat of foreign imperialism. In this respect, the Chinese Communists might well have considered the nationalism-based united front in the May Fourth protest as a useful precedent for their collaboration with the Kuomintang in the 1920s, as well as for the CCP's united front policy during the Anti-Japanese War.

The legacy of May Fourth on Chinese Communism has also been frequently alluded to in connection with the Cultural Revolution of the late 1960s.(16) In this respect, the comparison that has been most often drawn is the common attempt to create a "new man" in preparation for the coming of a better society. As far as the May Fourth period is concerned, this element was perhaps most evident during the New Culture Movement, in which the new intellectuals believed that a democratic republic would only be a reality when the Chinese people were all infused with democratic ideals. As in the Cultural Revolution, the basic assumption underscoring such a strategy was a confidence in the power of ideas to bring about historical changes. Such confidence was not unlike the faith in the power of conscious, human

action which we have just mentioned. The counterpart of such an idea in the Cultural Revolution was the affirmation that "Nothing is impossible" or that "The subjective creates the objective".

Among the other common features that have been drawn between the May Fourth Movement and the Cultural Revolution are the following. In both movements, it was stressed that the injection of new ideas had to be accompanied, if not preceded, by the destruction of the old ideas. A corollary of this was the attack on establishment personnel and institutions. In both movements, the positions of the front-line troops were given over to the young, in the belief that they were least likely to be contaminated by the "poisonous weeds" that were the old ideas, and that they had the mobility and idealism to carry out their enterprise. Both movements also originated in the cultural-intellectual sphere, and then developed overt political overtones in the later stages, a development that was accompanied by the entry of other social groups into the conflict.

Therefore the May Fourth period was important in the history of Chinese Communism, not only in that it saw the founding of the party, but also in that many of the basic motivations and assumptions of the period have influenced the development of the party and its ideology right up to today. Indeed, the May Fourth Movement has always been credited with a great deal of importance in Chinese Communist historiography. Many thousands of words have been written on the subject, mainly in the 1950s and early 1960s, and the official interpretation has not been challenged during the Cultural Revolution. It is the Chinese Communists' view of the May Fourth that we shall now discuss.

The historical periodisation given by Chinese Communist historiography to the May Fourth Movement is that it marked the point in modern history when the bourgeois-democratic revolution changed from a democratic revolution of the old type to a

democratic revolution of the new type, the new democratic revolution. The qualitative difference between the two is defined as being that, whereas it was "the petty bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie (through their intellectuals)" who were the political leaders in the old democratic revolution, it was the proletariat who were the leaders in the new democratic revolution.(17) The old democratic revolution was deemed to have lasted from the Opium War to the May Fourth Movement. During these eighty years, which saw successively the Taiping Rebellion, the Hundred Days' Reform, the Boxer Rebellion and the 1911 Revolution, the Chinese bourgeoisie, because of its very nature, were prone to compromise with imperialism and feudalism, and were thus unable to carry out the revolution to the end.(18)

The occurrence of the Movement itself is identified as the synthesis of various internal and external contradictions: the in-fighting between the various warlords and reactionary political cliques, their oppressive and exploitative rule, the foreign imperialist penetration of China, and the brief respite given to native industry during the wartime period which saw the emergence of a Chinese working class.

> The May Fourth Movement thus occurred and developed on the foundation of an unprecedented awakening of the broad masses of the Chinese people, and of the fact that the Chinese working class had already become an independent force in the political struggle.(19)

As we have already seen in the discussion regarding the "proletarian origin" of the CCP, although the existence of a Chinese working class was real enough by this time, it would be difficult to describe it as "an independent political force", or to suggest that one of the prime reasons for the occurrence of either the May Fourth Movement or the protest in 1919 was the militancy of the Chinese working class. The Chinese workers did play an important part in the protest movement, but

as in the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s, it was the country's youth that first gave momentum to the movement. Again, the Chinese labour movement did develop rapidly in the early 1960s, but this was in part due to the organisational activities of the CCP. It might be for these reasons that Chinese Communist historiography dates the "May Fourth period" lasting only from 1919 to the founding of the party in 1921.(20)

This leads to a discussion of the question of who, or which social group, were the leaders of the May Fourth Movement, and the extent of the part played by intellectuals. One lesson which was suggested by the rapid progress of the protest movement, and which the new intellectuals were not slow to grasp, was the power of concerted, direct action of the masses, which, in the context of the protest over Versailles, consisted of not only students and workers, but also merchants and industrialists. This lesson in the efficacy of mass action is acknowledged in the Chinese Communist historiography of May Fourth.(21) But at the same time, Chinese Communist historians also suggest that the mass outburst in 1919 was largely brought about by the inspirational example of the October Revolution and the work of Marxist intellectuals.

> Following the October Revolution, the Communist intellectuals became the leading elements in the united front of the New Culture Movement in China, and socialist culture and thought became its guiding thought. A new patriotic sentiment on the part of the Chinese people was brought about by the victory of the October Revolution, as well as by the culture and thought which accompanied this kind of revolution. When this patriotic sentiment of the masses developed to a certain point, an unprecedented political action, the May Fourth Movement, was imminent.(22)

It is of course fair to describe the May Fourth protest as largely a nationalism-motivated movement. But the nationalism manifested in 1919 could hardly be described as being in the main stimulated by the example of the October Revolution. The nationalistic indignation that exploded in 1919 had already

manifested itself unmistakably since the protest over Japan's Twenty-One Demands in 1915. Again, as we have seen in the discussion concerning the October Revolution, the news of the October Revolution was much less enthusiastically received in China than the Karakhan Proposal was in March 1920, when the protest movement had been in full swing for nearly a year. But what concerns us more here is the question of whether the Marxist intellectuals played a leading role in the events of May Fourth. The idea suggested by the above passage, that, following the October Revolution, the Marxist intellectuals assumed leadership of the New Culture Movement and of the subsequent May Fourth protest, cannot be accepted, except in the highly dubious sense that some of the activists who participated in the movement, such as Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Mao Tse-tung, were later to become Marxist. Ch'en Tu-hsiu himself, writing in 1924, had asserted that the May Fourth protest was a national movement led by the petty bourgeoisie and youths.(23) As has already been pointed out, right up to May 1919, the only leading intellectual who could be described as Marxist was Li Ta-chao. For the others, their conversion to Marxism was the result, and not the cause, of the turbulent events in 1919. Again, at the conclusion of the First World War, the new intellectuals had pinned their hopes on the good intentions of the great powers, so they were not only greatly disillusioned by the news from Versailles, but were also, to some extent, initially taken unaware by the outburst of mass indignation, though they were not slow to involve themselves in the protest movement. Thus, in a way, one could indeed say that the New Culture Movement had raised the democratic expectations of the Chinese people, but, at the same time, the new intellectuals were not fully aware of, and certainly did not plan, the coming of the events in May 1919.

Bearing in mind that the Chinese Communists' dating of the May Fourth period is from May 1919 to July 1921, there is

relatively more credence to their analysis that the movement was a united front of "communist intellectuals, revolutionary petty-bourgeois intellectuals and bourgeois intellectuals."(24) Representative figures of these three groups of intellectuals were respectively identified as Li Ta-chao and Mao Tse-tung, Lu Hsün and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, and Hu Shih.(25) The collapse of this united front of new intellectuals in 1921 is analysed in the following terms.

> For the three groups of intellectuals who took part in the May Fourth Movement, since they took up different attitudes towards the masses of workers and peasants and towards Marxism, they also took up different attitudes towards the main contradictions in the Chinese revolution. In the end, they went their separate ways.(26)

Both Li Ta-chao and Mao Tse-tung have been given pride of place in this alliance. Li, in particular, has been credited with identifying the evil nature of imperialism and the correctness of Marxism at a point in time prior to the May Fourth Incident (27), and his "victory" over Hu Shih in the "Problems & Isms" debate has been described as foretelling the victory of Marxism in China.(28) Although Li was not totally rid of his reservations about Marxism until the end of 1919, that is, after the "Problems & Isms" debate in the summer of that year, he can justifiably be described as China's first Marxist, and, as we have seen, his interpretations of Marxism survived most strongly after his death in 1927.

But if one person is to be chosen as the "Man of the Movement", the title should certainly go to Ch'en Tu-hsiu. The rise of Mao Tse-tung belongs t another story, and, as will be described in the following section, Hu Shih remained bogged down in New Culture ideology. Ch'en Tu-hsiu not only played as leading a role as anybody else in the New Culture Movement, the May Fourth protest and the first years of the Chinese Communist Party, but also, for the purpose of a discussion of the changing political attitude in the May Fourth period, he reflected virtually all the

motivations, hopes and assumptions of the new intellectuals of this period. In the 1915-1918 years, Ch'en was a fervent believer in the power of science and democracy to bring China into the modern world. The events in 1919 brought on doubts, disillusionment, a more political and direct approach, and finally a new ideological world-view which led to the formation of the CCP and his election to the party leadership. The story of the ideological development of Ch'en Tu-hsiu over these years, such as his "late" conversion to Marxism after the events in 1919, throws more light on the political thinking of the contemporary radical intelligentsia than do either the story of Li Ta-chao or Hu Shih.

In Chinese Communist historiography, Ch'en Tu-hsiu is described as the first of a long line of "class enemies within the party" which includes such persons as Wang Ming and Liu Shao-ch'i. (29) This judgement is of course based more on an interpretation of Ch'en's stewardship of the party during the 1921-1927 years than on an interpretation of the part that he played during the May Fourth Movement. Indeed, the latter interpretation is at times ambivalent, and can best be regarded as part of the "retrospective indictment" of a party member. The following passage is characteristic.

> Prior to the introduction of Marxism into China, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was a radical democrat (chi-chin min-chu chu-i che 急進民主主義者) Later on, he became a very influential propagandist for socialism, as well as a founding member of the party. In the First Congress of the Party, Ch'en Tu-hsiu was elected to the responsibility of leading the Central Committee, but he was not a good Marxist.(30)

The party historians now identify the "capitulationist line" under Ch'en as the "subjective reason" for the failure of the First Great Revolution (1924-1927)(31). Ch'en's case is of course not helped by the fact that he was expelled from the party in 1929 as a "Trotskyite", and that in the late 1930's, he himself retracted many of his Marxist beliefs.

However, although Ch'en Tu-hsiu is regarded here as the most

representative figure of the May Fourth Movement, this is not to suggest that he was its leader. There was no single leader in the sense that Mao Tse-tung was later to be the leader of the Chinese Communist movement. It is even difficult to speak of any collective leadership, even during the years of the New Culture Movement when the leading new intellectuals were working together. During these early years, relationships between them were informal, and they were brought together only tenuously by the common assumption that the transformation of China lay in a cultural and spiritual change in the minds of the Chinese people. The May Fourth protest was not planned by any of the new intellectuals. They were as much shocked by the news from Versailles as the rest of the Chinese populace. What happened next was a genuine groundswell of nationalistic outburst, of which the new intellectuals were part, and in which they played the part of giving the movement form and momentum. It was only after the occurrence of these events in 1919, that the united front of the new intellectuals collapsed, and one can begin to speak of the existence of three discernable groups of intellectuals: Communist, revolutionary petty-bourgeois, and bourgeois intellectuals.

Aside from the question of which intellectual group were the leaders of the May Fourth Movement, there is the question of the extent of the contribution of the various social groups in Chinese society. Chinese Communist historiography acknowledges the fact that "the May Fourth Movement was initiated by youths and students" and supported by the participation of "the broad masses of the working class and sections of the petty-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie."(52) In particular, a great deal of significance is attached to the June Third Movement in 1919 (See Chapter 3, Section 1), which marked the point at which Chinese workers joined in the protest movement. Chinese Communist historians stress that it was only

with the participation of the worker that the movement became a "nation-wide revolutionary movement" and entered a "new historical phase."(33) It is further argued that it was the entry of the workers and the subsequent rapid development of the labour movement that began to show up the true nature of bourgeois intellectuals such as Hu Shih. (34) It was perhaps not a coincidence that it was at this stage that Hu Shih first initiated the "Problems & Isms" debate with Li Ta-chao, as he sensed a new turn in the movement.

Central to this discussion as to which group of intellectuals and which social groups were the leaders of the May Fourth Movement is the question of the relationship between the intellectuals and the masses, and in particular, as far as the Chinese Communist historiography is concerned, the relationship between the Communist intellectuals and the proletariat. On this question, Chinese Communist historians take the view that, although the "objective condition" of a "developed" proletariat was there, the Marxist intellectuals were crucial in giving the movement its "Marxist orientation!"

> Marxism is naturally deduced from the foundation or the experience of the international workers' movement, but one could not expect the workers' movement to instinctively "climb up to"(pa-sheng 爬上)the high peak of scientific communism. In the introduction and Spread of Marxism-Leninism in China, it was the "first to be aware"("shou-hsien chio-wu"" 首先覺悟 ") intellectuals who constituted the "bridge"(ch'iao-liang"" 橋樑 "). If the revolutionary intellectuals had not played their part, then the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal political struggle of "May Fourth" would not have had the guidance of Marxism-Leninism.(35)

Such a postulation essentially reflects the concrete origin of Marxism in China, though, as we have just discussed, one may question whether the May Fourth Movement was in fact directed by the Communist intellectuals. In addition, the above postulation seems to challenge the "proletarian inevitability" of Marxism in China, and gives a somewhat un-Marxist emphasis on the power of ideas. For example, the two articles published by Li Ta-chao in November 1918,

"The Victory of Bolshevism" and "The Victory of the common people," have been credited with "opening up a bright and great road for the democratic awakening movement in China."(36) Chinese Communist historians are aware of this ambivalence, and emphasise strongly that "the workers and peasants ..... are the fountain of true revolutionary power," and that, if the intellectuals "fail to unite with the masses of workers and peasants, they will be but so much dry fish on a beach."(37)

Thus, in the context of May Fourth, the Communist intellectuals are deemed to have united Marxism with the workers' movement, and the formation of the CCP is seen to be a union of Marxist intellectuals and workers.(38) Although such a union did take place as early as the formation of the first Communist groups in 1920,(see Chapter 3 ,Section 11) this does not alter the fact (the acknowledgement of which is implied indirectly by Chinese Communist historians) that it was the intellectuals who took the initiative in uniting with the workers, and that it was Marxism which turned their attention to the proletariat, and not vice versa.

In a still broader context, Chinese Communism was born in the context of May Fourth, and it is a misrepresentation to suggest that the events leading up to and during 1919 were directed by the first Chinese Marxists. As we have seen, Marxism was not an unknown quantity in China prior to 1919. The radical intellectuals' rediscovery of the ideology was not much prompted by the October Revolution in Russia, as by the developments arising from the May Fourth protest movement. The storm of the sentiments, motivation and assumptions of this period was so strong that it remained with the party for many years to come. The discussion of the party's historiography of the May Fourth Movement should not be taken in any way to devalue the significance of the movement of Chinese Communism. It was the foremost feature of the period, an almost desperate nationalism - expressed in the short-

term in the protest over Shantung, and in the long-term in the search in the New Culture Movement for a way to save the country - that was the crucial factor in convincing a group of the new intellectuals that Marxism was the way for China. The year 1919 was the turning point in their conversion. Their disillusionment and bitterness against the Western powers developed into a rejection of Western political values, and they also came to the conclusion that their previous cultural-intellectual approach would take too long in the face of an observed total crisis for the nation and in view of the rapid success brought about by direct action in the protest movement. It was in such a context that Marxism gained the commitment of Ch'en Tu-hsiu and others. The existence of a Marxist government in Russia and a proletariat in China were only of secondary importance in confirming the faith after the conversion had taken place.

Thus, in their nationalism, in their desperate intention to transform China into a strong country, and in the urgency and enthusiasm with which they plunged directly into political work, the first Chinese Communists were very much the creatures of the period, and they were awarded with success. The same could not be said of Hu Shih and the other Chinese liberals of the period, and it is to an interpretation of the causes and nature of their failure that we will now turn.

3. THE POLITICAL WILL-BREAK OF CHINESE LIBERALISM

The course of liberalism in China is of considerable historical interest for the simple reason that the first generation of Chinese Marxists had all been liberals prior to their conversion to Marxism. As the history of NCH demonstrates most clearly, Ch'en Tu-hsiu and others had all come from that group of New Culture intellectuals that subscribed to the liberal and democratic ideals of the bourgeois West. From 1919 onwards, one part of this group held on to their intellectual and political beliefs and thereby "missed the boat", while another group embarked on a new political course that ultimately led to

transform Chinese society.

In this section, we shall look at the nature of Hu Shih's brand of liberalism, its weaknesses in the context of the period, and the nature of the opposition between Chinese liberalism and Marxism. In what follows, we shall concentrate on the ideas and action of Hu Shih, since he was not only a leading member of HCN, but was also regarded by the other liberals, as the leading figure of liberalism in China.

The basis of Hu's liberalism was the pragmatist philosophy. In December 1919, he remarked that "the fundamental meaning of the new thought tide" was but "the critical spirit".(39) In a political context, this belief in pragmatism naturally led him to reject any ideology that purported to offer any all-in solution, and this was in fact the basis of his contention in the "Problems and Isms" debate in 1919, the first occasion in which Hu Shih openly clashed with the Marxists. A corollary of his pragmatist philosophy was individualism. Hu believed that it was indeed a person's social responsibility to exercise his "critical spirit", and that, at the same time, the social and political environment should be conducive for an individual to exercise his social philosophy.(40) Such a conception of the positive social function of individualism in creating a viable and dynamic society was very evident in the ideology of the New Culture Movement. (see Chapter 2, Section 4), and it has often been pointed out that this feature of the Chinese variant of liberalism had been evident form the time when Yen Fu and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao first introduced liberalism into China.(41)

As with Yen Fu and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, the New Culture intellectuals' emphasis on this aspect of liberalism was motivated primarily by their desire to see a strong China. Hu Shih was no exception. He was as much politically and intellectually committed to liberalism as he was emotionally committed to the transformation of China. As Grieder comments,

> Despite his profound distrust of nationalistic emotions, Hu was in his own fashion as much a nationalist as were the men whose intellectual prejudices and political strategies he deplored. He was deeply concerned for the fate of China, both as a nation and as a civilization. Over the years such terms as "national salvation" and "the revival of the race" recurred too often to be dismissed as empty rhetoric.(42)

But, as we shall see, in the post-1919 period, both the contents of the programme of action he put forward, and, just as importantly, the way in which it was put forward, were not in tune with the political sentiments and reality of the time. Writing in 1929, when Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh had already established a revolutionary base in the Chingkang Mountains and were carrying out drastic land reforms, Hu Shih had this to say about the nature of China's ills.

> What do we want to destroy? We want to destroy the five great national enemies: poverty, disease, ignorance, corruption and disorder.
>
> This enumeration of our five enemies does not include capitalism in China.....Nor feudalism, because feudalism in China ended 2000 years ago with the formation of the First Empire. Nor imperialism, because imperialism cannot injure a country that is not first devastated by those five devils.....Why has it (imperialism) chosen China for exploitation? Is it not because we have been so greatly weakened by the five devils that we no longer possess the power of resistance? Therefore, even if it be merely for the sake of resisting imperialist exploitation, it is our imperative duty first to overthrow these five enemies.(43)

Hu's analysis seems a classic case of mistakenly identifying the symptoms for the illness. Whether one subscribes or not to the view that imperialism was the illness, and there were many in China at the time who did, both Communists and non-Communists, one could not help but feel that Hu's "five devils" were so well-known to the ordinary Chinese people that they must have felt that Hu was but merely stating the obvious.

In common with the Marxists, Hu's programme also consisted of a rejection of the past, but the reformism implicit in his pragmatist philosophy necessarily meant that change consisted of grafting the new on to the old. He was not unaware of the nature of this process, but

instead of seeing in it a possible inhibitor to development and the realisation of new ideas, he regarded it as a vindication of the pragmatist philosophy. Writing in 1934, this is how he visualised the "finished product".

> Slowly, quietly, but unmistakably, the Chinese Renaissance is becoming a reality. The product of this rebirth looks suspiciously occidental. But, scratch its surface and you will find that the stuff of which it is made is essentially the Chinese bedrock which much weathering and corrosion have made stand out more clearly — the humanistic and rationalistic China resurrected by the touch of the scientific and democratic civilisation of the new world. (44)

But what is basic and essential to the feasability of Hu's programme is a relative "moldability" of the core, and Chinese traditionalism and the old society were powerful drags that prevented Hu's evolutionist programme from taking off. In this sense, it could perhaps be said that Hu mistakenly believed in the universal applicability of pragmatism, which is in the main the product of a society in which there is no great conflict between the past and the present, and in which there is a great enough consensus in regards to societal goals to make possible a process of selective and gradual improvements. The China of the first half of the twentieth century did not fulfil either of these two qualifications. In this respect, an ironic comment could perhaps be made on the fact that Hu himself spoke up against supposed universal panacea during the "Problems & Isms" debate. The difficulty in the applicability of pragmatism to the Chinese context is indirectly suggested by a recent study of Dewey's influence on China, in which the authors remark on the difficulty in assessing the thinker's influence on "such a rapidly changing scene". (45)

Given the pragmatism in his world-view, it was not surprising that Hu Shih viewed the assumptions inherent in Marxism with great disquiet, and in the Chinese context, this was further aggravated

by his disagreement with the Chinese Communists' depiction of imperialism as the main culprit in the Chinese situation. In 1929, Hu wrote of his fundamental opposition to the CCP's political proposals, and suggested his own.

> If these are to be called "Revolutions", then I am not ashamed of being called a "counter-revolutionary"! For such revolutions only waste our time and energy, destroy our social and national vitality, and sow the seeds of hatred and massacre. They ignore our real enemies and lead us further and further away from our real objective, the creation of a modern nation.
> Our real enemies, as I have pointed out, are poverty, disease, ignorance, corruption and civil war. None of them can be conquered by recourse to violent force. The real revolution which shall overthrow these five devils, has only one path to pursue, namely the royal road of piece-meal reformation under conscious and intelligent guidance. (46)

With respect to the piece-meal reconstruction of China that he spoke of , in the post-1919 period, Hu Shih clung to the New Culture view that the only genuine solution was a cultural rejuvenation and not social and political reforms. A striking example of this was his reaction to the May 30th Movement in 1925, when another wave of nationalistic demostrations swept the country.

> In this period when patriotism is highly lauded, we wish to point out most sincerely what Ibsen called "true individualism" is the only great road to patriotism. The salvation of the nation begins with your own individual salvation. (47 emphasis in the original)

The promotion of individualistic values in the post-1919 period had one weakness. Whereas the New Culture intellectuals had regarded individualism as a possible way for releasing the people's energies for nation-building, the trend in the post-1919 period was to look to direct and concerted political action. In this sense, one could say that the nationalism which had been all the time simmering under the New Culture movement boiled over in May 1919, after which the intensity of the political activities was such that many regarded individualism as an intellectual luxury. On the other hand, in its political strategy, the CCP was able to exploit

the general feeling that a concerted effort should be made to put the nation on its feet. In its propaganda effort, it frequently emphasised the national interest over class considerations, and in doing so, succeeded much more in tapping the popular sentiment than Hu Shih's promotion of individualism.

Such then were the contents and weakness of Hu's programme in the 1920 's, but an equally important factor for the political still-birth of liberalism in this period was the way in which the liberals put over their programme, and their greatest weakness in this respect was the absence of any political organisation.

Partly due to his pragmatist philosophy, Hu saw himself, as he would like to see other intellectuals, as an independent critic of the political scene. He believed that affiliation with any political party would inevitable prejudice his impartiality in the work of analysing and criticising the political developments in the country. Another reason for his aversion to political involvements lay perhaps in his temperament. In 1922, he wrote:

> Philosophy is my vocation, and literature is my pastime. Politics is only a new endeavour which I have been provoked into. In my house, there is only one book on politics to every five thousand books on other subjects. (48)

In putting himself forward as an aloof keeper of the political conscience of the nation, he envisaged that, in the long run, reason and democratic good sense would bring public opinion to bear powerfully on the country's politics. However, consciously and unconsciously, he virtually only made his appeal, and associated himself with, a narrow audience of westernised intellectuals, many of whom, like himself, had been educated abroad and were able to have some comprehension of the nature of his programme. The workers in the cities and the masses of peasantry in the hinterland, one feels, could relate much more directly to "feudalism", "capitalism" and "imperialism", than to "Ibsenism" or "pragmatism".

In projecting the Western ideas of liberalism and individualism to his countrymen, Hu's "cosmopolitanism" was a definite handicap in a period of ardent nationalism that was the 1920's. At a time when the yardstick used to measure a person's patriotism was the extent of his political commitment, Hu's intellectual sophistication and apparent emotional detachment could easily have been interpreted by his audience as a lack of patriotic concern. Grieder has rightly described Hu Shih, "in an angrily nationlistic era", as "a more comfortable citizen of his century than of his country". (49)

In this respect, Hu was also frequently attacked by his contemporary critics for advocating "wholesale westernisation". This was a very damaging charge, considering both the nationalistic sentiment of the period and the widely-held view after the traumatic episode at Versailles that China should not follow the way of the capitalistic and militaristic West. Joseph Levenson, in his study of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, has commented on this "psychological inadequacy" inherent in Hu's programme.

> The communistic theory which led them (the Chinese Communists) to deal so coldly with Chinese civilisation was no respector of non-Communist Western civilisation. Liang's (Ch'i-ch'ao) theory, too, contriving to let China swallow industrialisation and science, was able to sweeten the pill. Only he who rejected both these theories took his Westernisation plain and not glossed over. He might call himself, proudly, a man; but such men could not be numerous. (50)

For all the above reasons — his reluctance to involve himself directly in politics (let alone to establish a political organisation), the intellectual sophistication of the terminology of his programme, and the somewhat cosmopolitan tone in which it was made (not to mention the several inherent weaknesses in the programme itself,) — Hu Shih and the other Chinese liberals never found any real political foothold.

Thus the only political power of which the liberals could avail themselves depended on the limited extent to which the

governments of warlords and bureaucrats were prepared to accept their appeals. The brief participation by several liberal scholars in the Peking government in 1922 showed how limited official patience was. Indeed, it had been a lack of success during the New Culture Movement in changing the position of the Government that led some of the new intellectuals into taking up direct political work among the people in the post-1919 period. The protest movement in 1919 showed that public opinion, only when it was articulated in the form of direct political action, and not in the form of verbal appeals by intellectuals, was powerful enough to be heeded by those in authority.

The political cul-de-sac into which the liberals had travelled by the late 1920's could perhaps best be summed up by the following cogent remark made by Grieder.

> I am fairly certain that, had the liberals acted upon the advice that has so often been proffered retrospectively, they would not have long remained liberals. They would have become (as some did), mildly critical supporters of the status quo, or advocates of conservative reaction, abandoning their liberal aims; or they would have become (as again some did) revolutionaries, abandoning their attachment to liberal means. This argument, then, seems to reduce itself ultimately to the proposition that, under the circumstances, the price of success for the liberals was the sacrifice of liberalism. (51),(emphasis and parentheses in the original)

Liberalism came to prominence on the Chinese intellectual scene during the New Culture Movement in the years before May 1919. Given the basic aim of the movement --- a gradual transformation of Chinese society by essentially cultural-intellectual means --- the Chinese variant of liberalism, with its emphasis on pragmatism and socially-positive individualism, found ready support. But the nationalism which provided the initial impetus for the New Culture Movement was, from May 1919, part of the undoing of liberalism in China. From that date on, Chinese nationalism took

on a much more strident form, and, in the course of the 1920s, the failure of the Chinese liberals to adjust their mode of operation to the new political situation and climate became increasingly apparent. Of the ideology itself, it could perhaps be said, in particular of its pragmatist variant, that it was more suited to a society with less basic ills than China. Furthermore, the Chinese liberals, unlike the Chinese Communists, were disinclined to modify and transform their ideology to fit in with the Chinese situation.

4. HCN and the History of the May Fourth Period

The span of almost eleven years of the period of publication of HCN, from September 1915 to July 1926, is generally agreed to be one of the most crucial periods in modern Chinese history. An attempted interpretation of the period will be made in the following concluding section, while here we shall briefly look back on the history of the magazine, examine the Chinese Communist view of the publication, assess its significance for the period, and look at the possible limitations inherent in viewing a period through the pages of a contemporary periodical.

HCN's period of publication saw successively the New Culture Movement, the May Fourth protest, the founding of the Chinese Communist Party, and the development of a national movement. The magazine not only provides in its pages rich materials for a history of modern Chinese thought, but was also, in more concrete terms, the nearest thing to a headquarters that the New Culture Movement had, as well as the seat of the initial conflict between the liberals and the Marxists. The magazine has been variously described by modern Western writers as "the undisputed organ of the advanced intelligentsia after 1915", "the leading organ of China's emerging westernised intelligentsia", a publication that played "an extraordinary part in the May Fourth Movement", and as "China's leading

journal of radical opinion" of the period.(52)

Chinese Communist historians also regard HCN with the same importance. This "child of the Chinese Revolution" ("Chung-kuo ko-ming ti ch'an-erh" 中國革命的產兒) has been described as "the most important materials for an understanding and study of the period from May Fourth Movement to the founding of the party".(53) In the context of the New Culture Movement, HCN has been further described as "a crystallisation of the united front of the union of the three forces of the Communists, the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries and the bourgeoisie." (54) As for the magazine in its Marxists phase, it has been credited with "great achievements" in its propagation of Marxism-Leninism and its attack on deviant ideologies. (55) However, as we saw in the respective chapters of the present thesis, Chinese Communist historians also make a point of noting the ideological shortcomings of the magazine, in both its liberal-bourgeoise and its Marxist phases. Indeed, the suggestion has been made that HCN's own history demonstrates the Marxist-Leninist truth as it relates to the work of periodical publications: that a periodical is an effective class weapon, and in an obvious reference to HCN's "apolitical" phase, that a period is doomed to failure if it does not unite closely with the concrete revolutionary struggle. (56)

In the makeup and changes in its editorial contents and personnel, the HCN was a microcosm of the period. But there is a certain limit to the extent of this relationship. There is the obvious point that a periodical, however important, cannot possibly be the history of a period. To this end, I have made an effort to set the historical background in each chapter for each of the succeeding phases of the May Fourth Movement and the 1920s. Then there is the related point that not all the important articles of this period were published in HCN, and in this respect I have consulted, where

desirable and possible, the other important periodicals of the period.

However, despite this limitation, there is an advantage in looking at the period through the pages of a magazine that is akin to the intention of most intellectual biographies. I hope that this detailed study of the corporate unit that was HCN, may provide a sense of the continuities and changes in the sentiments and attitudes of the period. The uniqueness of HCN, apart from its importance, was that it was one of the longest-running periodicals of the period, and its existence spanned nearly eleven years in which rapid and irrevocable changes took place in the Chinese radical intelligentsia. By closely following such changes in HCN, it is possible to gain an understanding of how the initial assumptions were modified by the course of historical events, and how the Marxist orientation took shape. This transition was described in the main in Chapter 3.

Overall, one may say that it was in its first and second phases, as described in Chapters 2 and 3, that HCN was a good reflection of the thinking of the larger community of new intellectuals. From 1915 to 1919, a remarkable concentration of China's leading new intellectuals were either active contributors or editors of the magazine, and a great many of the themes and discussions of the New Culture Movement were first initiated in HCN. Again, in the 1919-1920 period, the editorial contents of HCN reflected the soul-searching, new perspectives and commitments among the new intellectuals. The split that occurred between the reformists and revolutionaries on the magazine was also representative of a divergence in the wider community of the new intelligentsia.

As was noted in Chapter 4, HCN, in its Marxist phase, did not convey a full picture of the Chinese Communist movement, let alone, of course, the political attitudes of the other new intellectuals. During this period, it was primarily the CCP's theoretical journal,

and reported little on the concrete revolutionary situation. However, the theoretical discussions of Marxism in HCN were reflective of many of the particular interpretations of Marxism, sentiments and assumptions of the first Chinese Marxists. The debates which HCN waged with the other political groups also showed the Chinese Communists' theoretical disagreement with the non-Communist ideologies.

The Chinese Communists were the most historically significant group that emerged from the May Fourth period, and HCN provides rich materials for a study of the process of the formation of their ideology. In their statistical contents analysis of HCN, Sullivan and Solomon note that the value of using the magazine in such a study "lies partly in the prominence of its influence, and partly in the fact that its publication spans the critical period of time when alternative social and political ideas were being explored as solutions to China's problems."(57) The methodology employed in their study is generally valid and useful in identifying, through classifying the articles in the magazine into various categories, the successive intellectual stages by which the Marxist orientation was evolved.(58)

However, their interpretation of the basis on which Marxism was accepted suggests further discussion. Sullivan and Solomon believe that the Marxist commitment came about because "Marxist-Leninist concepts served as new forms of political communication for expressing basically the same issues and modes of social action which had appeared in the pre-Marxist period of HCN," and they identify these themes as the emphasis on the scientific method, and the Western concepts of the nation and popular political participation.(59) This interpretation seems to beg the question of why the commitment to Marxism had not happened earlier, since Marxism had been known in China since the 1900s. For the answer,

one must look to the changes in the political attitudes of the HCN group of intellectuals. As was noted in Chapter 3, the May Fourth Incident was of pivotal importance in turning them from the West and Western values. It is true that, if anything, the previous desire for national "wealth and power" was now even stronger, but now the left-wing intellectuals were determined that this should not be realised by following the Western way of capitalism and individualism. On the question of popular political action, this was of course implicit in the promotion of democracy during the New Culture Movement. But at the same time, prior to the May Fourth Incident, the new intellectuals had fervently believed that the democratic goal could not, and should not, be achieved by direct political means, but by a cultural-intellectual transformation in the minds of the Chinese people. It was, again, the success of the protest movement that suggested the power of direct popular political action and the relevance of Marxism.

The above discussion suggests that intellectual history must be studied in the larger historical context. Important though HCN's part in the May Fourth Movement undoubtedly was, the changes in its editorial direction were but reflection of the changes in the historical circumstances. As noted in the concluding sections of the last four chapters, the contributions that HCN had made to the development of the historical circumstances consisted of helping to cast a new world-view for Chinese youths during the New Culture Movement and thereby indirectly helped to set the intellectual scene for the May Fourth protest movement by raising their expectations. In its Marxist phase, the magazine introduced discussion on Marxist-Leninist concepts, and made clear the Marxists' objections to other ideologies.

Therefore, although one can say that the history of HCN may be

taken to reflect the history of the period, its own contributions to the contemporary course of events should only be assessed in relation to other historical circumstances.

5. A Tentative Perspective On the May Fourth Period

The common and outstanding characteristic of all Chinese intellectuals, reformers and revolutionaries - from Kang Yu-wei to Sun Yat-sen, and from Hu Shih to Mao Tse-tung - was an overwhelming desire to see their country strong. Each of them worked towards this objective in their own way, but the basic element of nationalism underlined the lives and enterprise of them all. In this concluding section, I hope to look at the May Fourth Movement as one of the many attempts in modern Chinese history to make China strong, to see how the movement was different from the earlier attempts, and to assess its significance for later developments. But first, the objective of the "modernisation" of China will be looked at in relation to the nature and development of the basic motivation - nationalism. Consciously and unconsciously, the May Fourth intellectuals shared in the nationalistic sentiment that was so much a feature of modern China. They also recognised that their work was the latest attempt to make Chinese society viable in the modern world. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, for example, writing in 1923, noted that the contemporary national movement (kuo-min yün-tung 国民運動) had its origin in the defeat of China by Japan in the Sino-Japanese War of 1895 and the subsequent Hundred Days' Reform.(60)

China of course had ceased to be a closed civilisation long before 1895. The work of the traders and missionaries, and the fighting and loosing of foreign wars, had made foreign influence felt from the early nineteenth century. Foreign cultural influences came hot on the heels of the more concrete foreign in-

cursions, and by the late nineteenth century, some Chinese scholars and officials were already exploring the possibilities in Western social and political ideas. These new ideas, together with the more than obvious material superiority of Western civilisation, brought on the first intellectual alienation of the elite from Confucianism, and, in Levenson's phase, Confucius was demoted "from prophet to hero, just one of the species of good men in their day".(61) The intellectual legacy that these early reformers left to subsequent modernisers was the possibility of new hopes and perspectives that were outside the Confucian world.

But despite their intention to modernise China, they did not reject the cultural heritage totally, but only sought to improve on it. Their emotional ties to it were greater than their intellectual alienation from it. Such a variant of cultural nationalism continued to limit the scope of the modernisation attempts of generations of Chinese intellectuals and leaders, Sun Yat-sen included, right up to the May Fourth Movement. The reason was that a corollary of their declared objective to modernise China was the unfortunate embarrassment that, for China, modernisation meant Westernisation and a rejection of her centuries-old cultural heritage, and this the pre-May Fourth modernisers were not prepared to do.

What distinguishes May Fourth from earlier modernising movements is that this was when the intellectual leap was made and the above embarrassment accepted or ignored. Partly due to their observation of the failures and weaknesses of the earlier attempts, and partly due to their anguish over the acute internal and external difficulties facing the country, the May Fourth generation of modernisers was the first to demand not only a total cultural transplant of Western values, from those affecting personal relationships to those determining the makeup of the polity, but also

a severance of the same magnitude from China's own heritage. Such a premise was first established in the New Culture Movement, and there followed a telescoped import of a great number of Western ideas. In the early period of the May Fourth Movement, there was a more or less random, almost desperate, interest in all the various ideas of the democratic and bourgeois West. It was only in its later stage, that developments in the concrete situation not only suggested several specific ideas, but also demanded a choice be made.

It was on such an intellectual premise of the May Fourth Movement -- that of looking towards the Western cultural horizon for a solution, while rejecting China's own past -- that Marxism came to be intellectually and emotionally acceptable to the first Chinese Marxists. It was in such a way that the early anti-feudal and westernising aspects of the May Fourth Movement helped to "pave the way" for the commitment to Marxism. By the same token, one could say that, among other things, the Kuomintang's later emphasis on Confucianism as part of its ideology in the late 1920s and 1930s, discredited it in the eyes of many who, since the May Fourth Movement, had come to accept the view that Confucianism inhibited China's effort at modernisation.

The internationalism implicit in the projection of non-Chinese Western values and ideas in the May Fourth Movement did not diminish the nationalism that motivated and initially launched this modernisation effort. It was true that cultural nationalism briefly receded into the background, but it never disappeared, as evidenced by today's Chinese Communist reference to the fact that China has "a long history, a rich revolutionary tradition and a splendid historical heritage".(62) Today, of course it is the culture of the "labouring masses" in the feudal period, rather than the culture of the ruling elite, that is referred to as

the heritage of China, but the sentiment of the "uniqueness" of China's part is still very evident.

But in the immediate context of May Fourth, the projection of Western values added a new dimension to modern Chinese nationalism. The democratic ideas of the West also developed the idea among the new intellectuals and the patriotic youths that China was an independent sovereign nation-state, with all the attendent rights and privileges that the Western countries were enjoying. During the years of the First World War, the new intellectuals were confident that China's rights would be fully safeguarded by the allies at the conclusion of the war. Thus the totally unexpected news from Versailles inflamed all the more Chinese nationalistic indignation, and the subsequent protest movement was articulated on a much more "rational" and "sophisticated" level than the previous anti-foreign protests. On another level, the ideas of democracy and individualism that the New Culture Movement had been promoting, with the emphases that democracy was a collective enterprise and that a person should not be tied down by family obligations, motivated many youths to join in the protest movement. In other words, the contents of the modernisation effort in the first part of the May Fourth Movement in fact raised the nationalistic expectations of the people by imbuing them with the rights that China was entitled to, and the idea that the fate of the nation was also in their hands.

The events in 1919 also brought about the realization that China's degradation was as much due to the doings of the foreign Powers as to her own weaknesses, and that the modernisation effort could only succeed if China was rid of the stranglehold of the foreign imperialists. Some of the new intellectuals now questioned the wisdom of adopting Western bourgeois values, and began to take an interest in socialist ideas. This was the beginning of the

assertion that anti-imperialism was the paramount task in the modernisation effort. At the same time, they stressed that China's own problems were so fundamental and chronic that something more drastic than a cultural transformation should be called for. It was this assertion of anti-imperialism and the belief in a more fundamental approach that brought about a politicisation of the May Fourth Movement.

Of course, by its aim and nature, the May Fourth Movement, from the beginning of the New Culture Movement in 1915, was a political movement. What the new intellectuals sought prior to 1919 was not just an intellectual transformation of the Chinese people, but an intellectual transformation directed towards the political goal of a strong and democratic China. Up to 1919, the movement was only a cultural one in its modus operandi, in which the new intellectuals simply regarded education as a means of political mobilisation. They believed that politics was a function of culture (in the narrow sense of values and ideas), and that the development of a democratic tendency in the cultural sphere would bound to lead to democratic improvements in the political sphere, which was really what they wanted to see in their modernisation effort. Even Hu Shih, during the New Culture Movement, believed that his effort at literary reforms was directed not just for literature's sake, but also for the wider aim of making available the benefit of the written word to the Chinese masses so that they could be brought into the democratic process.(63) Again, the promotion of Western ideas and the attack on traditionalism were nothing less than an attempt to undermine the values that helped to prop up the existing political status quo. Finally, it was only because the earlier New Culture Movement was primarily politically-motivated that the seemingly unconnected issue of anti-

imperialism of May 1919 was able to turn the May Fourth Movement in another direction. Therefore, when one speaks of the politicisation of the movement after 1919, it is in reference to its modus operandi, since its primary motivation had always been political since the days of the New Culture Movement.

It was in such a context of politicalisation that the split between the liberals and the radicals occurred. The liberals continued to affirm that political changes could only be effected in a context of cultural change, whereas the radicals (and the Marxists) now asserted that changes could only flow from a transformation of the political situation. In the light of their emphasis on the cultural and educational approach, as well as their subsequent political failure, it is perhaps not surprising that the liberals in the main interpreted the May Fourth Movement as a cultural movement. Writing in 1934, Hu Shih looked back on it as "a movement of reason versus tradition, freedom versus authority, and glorification of life and human values versus their suppression."(64)

For the radicals, after 1919, not only was political activism the order of the day, but they no longer adhered to the same political principles as the liberals, and had quite different perceptions of the situation in China. Writing in 1924, Chiang Kuang-ch'ih, a regular contributor to HCM in its Marxist phase, offered a contemporary Marxist view on the split.

> At the time when Dr. Hu Shih-chih was advocating the New Culture Movement, there was as yet no manifestation of a polarisation of classes in the Chinese society. Thus, at the time, the intellectual class were almost unanimous in putting forward slogans of compromise. But now? The polarisation of classes has clearly manifested itself. The various sides of the revolution have accentuated not only the meaning of politics, but also the meaning of economics. Today, none of us can possibly continue to be ambivalent. We have to reveal the true face of society, and so the Chinese intellectual class have gone their separate ways.(65)

As we have seen, the liberals soon lost the initiative to the radicals of the CCP and the KMT, and the demise of their influence finally brought to an end the last major attempt to modernise Chinese society by cultural means. Henceforth, all those who wanted to change Chinese society would engage in direct political activism. In the words of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, speaking for both himself and many of his generation, the May Fourth Movement turned them "from empty thoughts to a concrete movement, and so began a new direction in the Chinese revolution."(66)

In the 1920s, the Chinese Communist Party, as well as the Kuomintang, were both motivated by and exploited the nationalism, anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism that had been such prominent features of the May Fourth period. In the words of Mao Tse-tung,

> Both in ideology and in the matter of cadres, the May 4th Movement paved the way for the founding of the Chinese Communist Party in 1921 and for the May 30th Movement and the Northern Expedition.(67)

As for the Kuomintang, from 1927 on, in line with its policy of relying on the support of the conservative elements in Chinese society, it went back on its anti-feudalism and propounded Confucianism in its ideology.

Chow Tse-tsung subtitles his admirable work on the May Fourth Movement as "Intellectual Revolution in Modern China", and he interprets the movement in the following way.

> The May Fourth Movement was actually a combined intellectual and sociopolitical movement to achieve national independence, the emancipation of the individual, and a just society by the modernisation of China. Essentially, it was an intellectual revolution in the broad sense, intellectual because it was based on the conviction that intellectual changes were a prerequisite for such a task of modernisation, because it precipitated a mainly intellectual awakening and transformation, and because it was led by intellectuals.(68)

The political nature of the movement should perhaps be stressed. It was set in a period of Chinese history when the country had experienced nearly a hundred years of internal decline and external humiliation. The participants of the movement were, and saw themselves as, modernisers who wanted to make China powerful. Unlike the previous modernisers, whom they regarded as having failed in their effort, the May Fourth generation rejected the notion that a solution could be found within the Chinese cultural horizon. But although they rejected cultural nationalism, the political motivation of nationalism remained and was indeed amplified during this period. Although the movement could be described as intellectual during its first years, the primary motivation was always nationalism and the objective was always a political one. In their initial promotion of Western bourgeois ideas, the May Fourth intellectuals were seeking to make China catch up with the West, and to emulate the latter's civilisation, in both its materialistic and spiritual aspects, which they considered to be superior in the modern world.

The events in 1919 not only multiplied the nationalistic concern, but also destroyed the esteem in which the Western model had been held. The demand now was for a solution that would not only be critical of the capitalistic and militaristic West, but would also provide China with the means by which to defend herself in the modern world. Chinese Marxism was born in such an ideological perspective imbued with nationalistic fervour, and its subsequent success lay in propelling, but not creating, the anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism that many now regarded as essential to the transformation of the Chinese nation. Great social and political changes have taken place since the May Fourth period, and contrary to the assertion of the early May Fourth participants, culture has been a function of such changes. But they helped on the long and arduous road to the discovery of that fundamental political solution.

Appendix A. Biographical Notes on the Personnel Associated with HCN.

The biographical note for each person concentrates on his background and career up to the time of the May Fourth period, and summarises briefly his later career.

The first six persons - Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Hu Shih, Li Ta-chao, Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung, Shen Yin-mo and Kao I-Han - were members of the editorial committee that was established in January 1918. The next four persons - Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, Liu Pan-nung, Lu Hs'in and Chou Tso-jen - were active members of the magazine during its liberal-bourgeois phase. The last six persons - Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, Ch'en Wang-tao, Li Ta, Chou Fo-hai, Chang Sung-nien and Shen Yen-ping - were active members of the magazine during its Marxist phase.

Ch'en Tu-hsiu 陳獨秀 (1879-1942) A native of Anhwei province, Ch'en came from a well-to-do family, and his father was an official in the Imperial government. His early education was a classical one; he was a successful candidate, and passed the first two civil service examinations by the age of eighteen. He then entered the famous Truth-Seeking College (Ch'iu-shih Shu-yüan 求是書院) in Hangchow where he studied naval architecture in French. This was his first close contact with Western civilisation, and in particular with French culture which later for a time epitomized for him the best in Western civilisation. In Hangchow, Ch'en also first demonstrated his political activism in anti-Manchu speeches. In 1902 and at the age of twenty-three, he went to study in Japan, where he became involved with students' politics. Upon returning to China in the same year, Ch'en started his career of active political journalism with the anti-Manchu Citizens' Daily (Kuo-min jih-jih k'an 國民日刊), and in 1904 established the Anhwei Vernacular Journal (An-hui su-hua pao 安徽俗話報). In 1906, after another brief stay in Japan, he taught for a year in a secondary school in his native Anhwei where he started another vernacular

magazine. The following year, he went off to France where he stayed for three years and became an enthusiastic admirer of French political and literary thought. Returning to China in 1910, he taught in Hangchow, and in the following year took part in the Revolution. He was then made Anhwei's commissioner of education by the new government. In 1913, he took part in the "second revolution" against Yüan Shih-k'ai, and after its failure fled to Japan, where he worked on Chang Shih-chao's anti-monarchical Tiger Magazine. In 1915 he returned to China, and in September of that year founded the HCN, of which he remained the editor until January 1918 when an editorial committee was formed to assume the editorship collectively.

As co-founder with Li Ta-chao of the CCP, Ch'en was the party's first Secretary-General from July 1921 to August 1927, when his "rightist opportunism of capitulating to the bourgeoisie" was condemned and he was replaced by Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai. In 1929, he was expelled from the party for his Trotskyist views. In October 1932, he was arrested by the Kuomintang and tried for the part he played in the Communist movement. Sentenced to thirteen years' imprisonment, he was released in August 1937 in a general amnesty granted to political prisoners following the Marco Polo Bridge Incident. In his last years, Ch'en rejected many of the Communist principles he had held earlier, and proposed parliamentary democracy.(1)

Hu Shih 胡適 (1891-1962) Like Ch'en, Hu Shih came from Anhwei and also a family which had distinguished itself in service to the imperial government. His education in the classics started at an early age. At the age of eleven, Hu went to school in Shanghai where he became influenced by Yen Fu's translations and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's writings. In 1910 he won the Boxer Indemnity Scholarship and went to study in United States. He received his B.A. from

Cornell in 1915 and his doctorate from Columbia in 1917, the latter for a thesis entitled "The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China". During his seven years stay in the United States, Hu was profoundly influenced by Western philosophy and in particular Dewey's pragmatism. He was also involved with Chinese students' politics in America, and edited the English-language Chinese Students' Monthly. He returned to China in the summer of 1917 and taught at Peking University.(2)

Shortly after his departure from HCN in 1921, Hu Shih and others founded the Endeavour Weekly (See Chapter 5 Section 2). When the magazine ceased publication in 1923, he continued with his literary writings. From 1927 to 1930 he taught philosophy at Shanghai. During this period, he contributed to The Crescent (Hsin yüeh 新月) magazine, and was mildly critical of the Kuomintang Government for its lack of democracy and a constitution. At the end of 1930, he was appointed as the Dean of the Faculty of Letters at Peita. During his stay in Peking, he wrote for The Independent Critic (Tu-li p'ing-lun 獨立評論), and continued to call for democratic reforms. The Japanese invasion helped to bring about an accomodation between Hu and the Kuomintang, and in September 1937, he left for the United States and Europe to plead for China's case. From 1938-1942, he was the Kuomintang government's ambassador to the United States, and took part in the founding conference of the United Nations in 1945. From 1946 to December 1948, he was the chancellor of Peking University. In 1949, he left for the United States, where, for the next nine years, he lived in semi-retirement. In 1958, upon his appointment as the president of the Academia Sinica, he went to live in Taiwan, until his death in 1962.(3)

Li Ta-chao 李大釗(1888-1927) Li is honoured today by the Chinese Communists as the principal founder of the Party. He first studied political science at the Peiyang College of Law and Political Science between 1907 and 1913. In the autumn of 1913, he went to Japan where he studied political economy at Waseda University in Tokyo. There he also worked closely with the Chinese Revolutionary Party (Chung-hua ko-ming tang 中華革命黨) a secret organisation established by Sun Yat-sen after the failure of the "second revolution". In April 1916 Li returned to China, and became associated with the moderate Progressive Party. From February 1918, he was the Chief Librarian at Peita and concurrently a professor of social sciences from September 1920.(4) Co-founder of the CCP with Ch'en Tu-hsiu, he is today regarded as the pioneer of Marxism in China. He was executed by Chang Tso-lin on April 28, 1927.

Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung 錢玄同(1887-1939) Ch'ien came from a distinguished family in Kiangsu, and could recite the basic Confucian classics at the age of ten. However, by the age of sixteen, he had become an anti-Manchu, and in the following year started a vernacular magazine. In 1905 he went to study in Japan, where two years later he organised with Lu Hsün, Chou Tso-jen and others the Society for the Rejuvenation of National Learning (Kuo-hsüeh chen-ch'i sho 國學振起社). In 1910 Ch'ien returned to China, and from 1913 taught linguistics at Peking University. Today, he is noted as among the first to devise a phonetic system and a system of simplification for Chinese characters.(5)

Shen Yin-mo 沈尹默 Born in Chekiang province in 1882, Shen was a graduate of Tokyo Imperial University. He was a noted poet of the time and also taught at Peita. His contributions to HCN consisted entirely of poetry of the new style. In later years, he was active in educational circles.(6) He remained on the mainland after 1949,

and took part in the anti-Hu Shih polemics in the early 1950s.(7)

Kao I-han 高一涵 Born in 1885 in Anhwei province, Kao was also a graduate from a Japanese university where he studied political science. Upon his return to China, he taught political science at Peita. Kao was a pioneer in this field in China, and introduced many Western political theories in his writings.(8) He remained in China after 1949, and held various positions in the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei 蔡元培 (1876-1940) A native of Chekiang, Ts'ai had a most successful career in the imperial bureaucracy before he became a leader in the New Culture Movement. He held the post of imperial editor (pien-hsiu 編修) between 1894 and 1898, but resigned after the failure of the Hundred Days Reform. From 1907 to 1911, he was studying at Leipzig University. He returned to China at the time of the 1911 Revolution and was active in it. In 1912 he was appointed Minister of Education in Sun Yat-sen's government, but resigned a few months later when Yüan Shih-k'ai came to power. He left for Germany again, and then stayed in France where he was involved in welfare work for the Chinese workers and students living there. In December 1916, he returned to China on his appointment as the Chancellor of Peking University. His reforms at the university were important in bringing the leading intellectuals together, and Ts'ai himself gave support to the students during the protest movement in 1919. In 1923, he resigned as Peita's Chancellor over the arbitrary arrest of a friend by the Peking government. From 1927 on, he held various important educational posts in the Kuomintang government. He died in 1940.(9)

Liu Fu 劉復 (also known as Liu Pan-nung 劉半農, 1891-1934) Liu came from a poor family in Kiangsu. He first studied Western languages at middle-school. In 1912 Liu went to Shanghai, where he made his living from writing and translation. His first contribution to HCN was in October 1916 in the second issue of the magazine. In 1917 he joined Peking University as an instructor in Chinese. In later years he was known for his poetry and his work on linguistics.(10)

Lu Hsün 魯迅 (pen-name of Chou Shu-jen 周樹人, 1881-1936) came from the family of a disgraced official. He first attended the Naval School in Nanking, but later transferred to a mining school. In 1902 he went on a government scholarship to study medicine in Japan. This he again abandoned 1906 in favour of his interest in literature. In 1909 he returned to China and took up various teaching jobs. From early 1912 he was a minor official in the Ministry of Education in the Peking government. Like Hu Shih, he later broke with the HCN group in 1920, and it was not until 1930 that he assumed the leadership of left-wing writers. He died in October 1936.(11) He is best remembered for his short stories and satirical pieces. The foremost proponent of revolutionary literature, Lu Hsün is today regarded as "China's greatest modern writer".

Chou Tso-jen 周作人

The brother of Lu Hsün, he was born in 1885 and received a classical education. Although a successful candidate in the civil service examination, he did not embark on a career in government service, but studied naval studies instead. During this time and his later student days in Japan, he came under the influence of Western literary and political theories. Upon his return to China in 1912, he was first an inspector of schools and then a teacher. In August 1917 he was invited

to join the Faculty of Letters at Peking University. In the 1920s and 1930s, he was well-known as an essayist and a translator of Western literary works and theories. In 1945, he was sentenced to death for collaborating with the Japanese. The sentence was subsequently commuted, allegedly with Hu Shih's intercession, to fifteen years' imprisonment. A full pardon was granted in February 1949. He remained on the mainland after liberation, and in 1953-1954 published two separate volumes on the life and works of his brother, Lu Hsün.(12)

Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai 瞿秋白 (1899-1935)

Ch'ü succeeded Ch'en Tu-hsiu as editor of HCN in June 1923 when the magazine was reorganised into a quarterly, until publication ceased in July 1926. He also succeeded Ch'en as secretary-general of the CCP at the August 7th Emergency Conference in 1927. He came from a bankrupt family of officials in Kiangsu. His father deserted the family when he was still young, and he was brought up by his mother. When he was sixteen, his mother, driven by poverty, committed suicide, and he started work as a primary-school teacher to support the family, and had to forego his intention of enrolling at Peking University. In September 1917, he entered the Russian Language School which was run by the the Foreign Affairs Ministry, partly because there was no charge of tuition fees at the school. At this time in his life, he had taken an interest in romantic literature and Buddhist ideas. But the intense nationalism of the May Fourth protest soon brought the young Ch'ü into political activism. Together with Cheng Chen-to and others, he founded in November 1919 The New Society (Hsin she-hui 新社會), a new periodical advocating anarchist, socialist and humanitarian ideas. This was suppressed by the Peking police in May 1920, but in August of

the same year, Ch'ü and Cheng founded the Humanity Monthly (Jen-tao yüeh-k'an 人道月刊), in which they put forward the ideas of idealistic socialism and social reform.(13) The May Fourth protest proved to be a turning point in his life, and one writer describes this change as follows.

> Indeed, no one has more right to the title of a man born of that movement. From then on he had to revise his views to fit into the Marxist doctrine he came to accept, and revolutionary activity began to take precedence over poetic and religious meditation. He was the best authority on the progress from an aspirant yogi to a would-be commissar in those critical years. (14)

In the autumn of 1920, he departed for Moscow as the Moscow correspondent of the Peking Morning Post (Ch'en-pao 晨報), and soon made a name for himself with his reports of the developments in Russia. In January 1922, he acted as the interpreter for the Chinese delegation to the First Congress of the Toilers of the East, and in the following month joined the Chinese Communist Party. Later in the year, at the Fourth Comintern Congress in Moscow, he met Ch'en Tu-hsiu and apparently so impressed Ch'en that the latter made him his secretary-interpreter.(15) In 1923, Ch'u returned to China, and was elected, together with Mao Tse-tung, to the party's Central Committee at the Third CCP Congress in July. His rapid promotion in the Party was no doubt helped by his first-hand knowledge of Russia and the Soviet leaders, but he was also noted for his writings on Marxist theory. His first contributions to HCN appeared in the first quarterly number in June 1923, when he took over the magazine's editorship from Ch'en Tu-hsiu. Up till the magazine ceased publication in July 1927, he penned many of the important articles in the pages of HCN.

At the August Emergency Conference in 1927, he replaced Ch'en Tu-hsiu as the party's secretary-general. Less than a year later, at the CCP's Sixth Congress held in Moscow, he was censured

for his "left opportunism" and replaced by Wang Ming. He remained in Moscow for two years, and served as the party's delegate to the Comintern. On his return to China in 1930, he was active on the League of Left-Wing Writers. Later he also served as commisioner of education in the Kiangsi Soviet. Captured by the Kuomintang in early 1935, he was executed in June.(16)

Ch'en Wang-tao 陳望道 (b. 1890)

Ch'en held the editorship of HCN for a brief month in January 1921 after Ch'en Tu-hsiu had departed from Shanghai for Canton. It was during his brief editorship that the printing-plates for an issue of the magazine were seized by the French Concession police, and the magazine was moved to Canton where Ch'en Tu-hsiu resumed his editorial responsibilities. A native of Chekiang, Ch'en Wang-tao had studied literature and sociology in Japan. On returning to China, he joined the editorial staff of a Shanghai newspaper, and later made the first complete Chinese translation of the Communist Manifesto. He also took part in the founding Congress of the CCP in July 1921, and thereafter played a part in the Communist educational activities. Ch'en's first contribution to HCN was the translation of a Japanese article on trade unions in Soviet Russia, which appeared in the January 1921 number, the issue that he edited. In 1927, he resigned from the party, and thereafter lectured in Chinese literature at the Futan University in Shanghai. However, he became involved in political activities again in the early 1940s. After 1949, he has held various official posts in the literary and education fields. (17)

Li Ta 李達

He came from a family of tenant farmers in Hunan. He had originally intended to become a teacher, and entered the Peking Higher Normal School in 1909. Then he came to believe that industry, science and

technology would be more important than education to the country, and accordingly enrolled at a trade-school in Hunan. In 1912, he went to Japan on a provincial scholarship to study mining science at Tokyo Imperial University, and it was during his stay in Japan that he became interested in social and political theories. According to his own testimony, he returned to China in 1918 under the influence of the October Revolution. He soon engaged himself in protest activities against the Peking government, and shortly after began to take an interest in Marxism. Li was present at the founding congress of the Party, and was appointed head of the propaganda department. From 1923, he taught at the Hunan University. In 1926, he published a book on Contemporary Sociology (Hsien-tai she-hui-hsüeh 現代社會學), being a systematic exposition of Marxism. He left the Party in 1927, but rejoined it later on. Li started to write for the HCN from January 1921. He later became one of the party's leading theoreticians on Marxist ideology.(18)

Chou Fo-hai 周佛海 (1897-1948)

Chou came from a modest family in Hunan. In 1917 he went to study in Japan where he became involved in Chinese students' politics. At the time he was studying economics at Kyoto Imperial University, under Kawakami Hajime who made the first Japanese translation of Das Kapital. On returning to China, Chou joined the Shanghai Communist group, and took part in the CCP's founding congress as the representative of Chinese students in Japan. He started to write for the HCN from January 1921. Later on, he taught at Kwangtung University and the Whampoa Military Academy. He resigned from the CCP in 1924 and joined the Kuomintang, and was for a time the acting head of the party's propaganda department. During the Anti-Japanese War, he held high office in Wang Ching-wei's puppet government, and was later imprisoned as a "national traitor".(19)

Chang Sung-nien 張崧年 (b. 1893)

A native of Hopei, Chang studied at Lyons University in France. On returning to China, he contributed to the Weekly Review, the political journal started by Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao in December 1918. He was a party member for a short period from 1921, and started to write for HCN from March 1919, notably on the ideas of Russell which were popular for a time during the latter's visit to China in the latter part of 1920. In the early 1930s, he was a professor of philosophy.(20) During the 1945-1949 civil war, he was accused by the CCP of "traitorous activities". (21)

Shen Yen-ping 沈雁冰 (b.1896)

He is better known under his pen-name of Mao Tun 茅盾 . A native of Chekiang, Shen came from a gentry family and received an early classical education. Later on, after a brief spell at Peking University, he was forced by financial difficulties to work as a proof-reader for the Commercial Press in Shanghai, but this work offered him an opportunity to acquire a knowledge of European literature. In November 1920, Shen, Chou Tso-jen, Cheng Chen-to and others founded the Literary Studies Society (Wen-Hsüeh yen-chiu-hui 文學研究會) which advocated a social literature. Shen was the editor of the Society's organ, Short Story Monthly (Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao 小說月報) in 1921, but in the following year gave up the editorship in order to take a greater part in political activities. He became active in the party's educational work, and in January 1926 was appointed as secretary to the CCP's propaganda department, and played an active part in the political work of the Northern Expedition. His first contribution to HCN appeared in October 1920. In the 1930s, he was active on the League of Left-Wing Writers, and is regarded today as one of the greatest modern Chinese novelists. He held the post of Minister of Culture until 1965.(22)

Appendix B. Important Periodicals of the May Fourth Period

The publication of Chinese periodicals was in the doldrums in the early 1910's, due mainly to the restrictive publication laws imposed by Yüan Shih-k'ai. (See Chapter 1 Section 2 for a closer examination of the periodicals of this early period.) But as the New Culture Movement developed from around 1915, a new type of periodical began to appear on the scene. A "new periodical" may be defined as one which promoted the introduction of new ideas, generally criticised Chinese tradition, and was published in the vernacular.

The great boom of the new periodicals began in the months prior to the May Fourth Incident in 1919, and reached its height in the latter part of 1919. Chow Tse-tsung estimates that over 700 new periodicals were founded in the period between 1915-23. (1) Even more remarkable is the fact that over half of these periodicals were the publications of the numerous organisations or groups that were set up in the wake of the May Fourth Incident to mobolise support for the protest movement.(2) The more important of these organisations were national ones, but the majority of them were based in one particular province or city.

In this appendix, we will look briefly at the more important of these new periodicals. These were the more influential ones, edited by leading member of the new intelligentsia, and the ones in which contributions from the leading new intellectuals made up the majority of articles. Several of these were the organs of political parties such as Kuomintang and the Progressive Party, but with all of them, there was no rigid editorial practice that barred contributions from non-members of the organisation that published the particular magazine; this , at least, was the case before the split in the movement in the early 1920s.

This survey, and the following one in Appendix C, is based on the

following sources. Additional sources are cited for some of the entries, and these will be individually cited.

Chung-kung chung-yang Ma-En-Lieh-Ssu chu-tso pien-i chü 中共中央馬恩列斯著作編譯局 (Central Committee of the CCP, Bureau of Edition and Translation of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin) ed. Wu-ssu shi-ch'i ch'i-k'an chieh-shao 五四時期期刊介紹 (An introduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth period) 3 volumes (Peking, 1958, 1959)

Ko Kung-chen 戈公振 Chung-kuo pao-hsüeh shih 中國報學史 (A history of Chinese journalism) 2nd edition (Shanghai, 1927)

Chow Tse-tsung, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement (Stanford U. Press, 1963)

Chang Ching-lu 張靜廬 compiled, Chung-kuo chin-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao 中國近代出版史料 (Source materials for the history of modern Chinese publishing) Ch'u-pien 初編 (Part 1) (Shanghai, 1953).
--------ibid, Erh-pien 二編 (Part 2) (Shanghai, 1954)
--------Chung-kuo hsien-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao 中國現代出版史料 (Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing) Chia-pien 甲編 (1st volume) (Shanghai, 1954)
-------- ibid, Ting-pien 丁編 (4th volume) (Shanghai, 1959)
--------Chung-kuo ch'u-pan shih-liao pu-pien 中國出版史料補編 (Supplementary materials for the history of Chinese publishing) (Peking, 1957)
Wang Che-fu 王哲甫 , Chung-kuo hsin-wen-hsüeh yün-tung shih 中國新文學運動史 (A short history of the Chinese new literature movement) (Peking, 1933)

Pacific Ocean (T'ai-ping-yang 太平洋) Monthly, then bimonthly.
Founded: March 1, 1917 in Shanghai, by some of the former members of the Tiger Magazine (Chia-yin tsa-chih 甲寅雜誌)(See Chap. 1 Section 2)
Ceased: June 5, 1925.
Remarks: It was a liberal magazine, and its members were mainly returned students from Britain, France, and the United States.

Weekly Critic (Mei-chou p'ing-lun 每週評論)
Founded: Dec. 22, 1918 in Peking, by Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao.
Ceased: September 1919, suppressed by the Peking government.
Remarks: In the years 1915-1918, it was part of the editorial policy of NCN not to discuss politics. Weekly Critic was founded by Ch'en and Li to voice their commentaries on the contemporary political situation. The magazine quickly established itself as a sharp political review, helped by the fact that it was published weekly and so could follow political developments closely.

It was opposed to warlordism, in particular the intimate relationship between the Tuan Ch'i-jui and the Japanese government. The weekly followed closely the negotiation in Versailles, and reported in some details the development of the subsequent protest movement. It was also one of the first new periodicals to take an interest in the condition of the Chinese workers.

Although the magazine was in existence for less

than a year, Chinese historians of today regard it as a "revolutionary political periodical that exerted important influence at the time", and as "one of the direct predecessors of the revolutionary publications of the Chinese working-class". (3)

Hu Shih did not work actively on the magazine in the beginning. In his own words:

> When in 1918, Mr. Ch'en and Mr. Li Ta-chao, who were interested in political affairs, started the weekly Critic, I did not criticise it. I recall that when they asked me to contribute to the magazine, I only sent them my translation of two short stories. (4)

However, in June 1919, with Ch'en's arrest and Li Ta-chao preoccupied with his other activities, Hu Shih agreed to take over the editorship of the weekly. It was in July that Hu initiated the "Problems & Isms" debate in issue No.31 of the magazine. Chinese historians today clearly distinguish the early period of the magazine from the period under Hu Shih's editorship which they regard as when the weekly was "a periodical of bourgeois reformism" (5)

New Tide or "The Renaissance", Monthly (Hsin chao 新潮).

Founded: Jan. 1, 1919 in Peking, by the New Tide Society of Peking University Students.

Ceased: March 1922.

Remarks: New Tide was one of the most influential new periodicals that were produced and edited by the students themselves. The New Tide Society that published the magazine was organised in November 1918. The magazine was founded two months later with the help of Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Li Ta-chao who secured financial and material help from the university for the students. Hu Shih and Chou Tso-jen gave further help. (6)

The aim of the magazine was published in the opening article of the first issue:

> We hope that all students in the country will take an interest in modern scientific thought, that they will be objective and critical and not subjective and prejudiced, that they will consider themselves to be men of the future and not of the present, and that they will have sufficient character to conquer our society and not be conquered by it. The spirit of our publication is the spirit of criticism.(7)

The magazine in the main advocated liberalism, democracy, science and literary reforms. The New Tide Society was reorganised and expanded in November 1919, following the May Fourth Incident. But from the following year, its activities decreased as its members went abroad to further their studies.

The Citizens, Monthly (Kuo-min 國民)

Founded: Jan. 1, 1919, by the Peking Student Society for National Salvation.

Ceased: May 1, 1921.

Remarks: The magazine generally promoted patriotism and rallied its readers to "save the nation", though it was also in favour of new ideas and literary reforms. It had

the support of Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, Li Ta-chao and Ch'en Tu-hsiu, while Chang Kuo-t'ao and Teng Chung-hsia were two of its student members. After the May Fourth Incident, the magazine showed an interest in socialist ideas, and was one of the first new periodicals that published translations of some of the writings of Marx.

The New Education, Monthly (Hsin chiao-yü 新教育)

Founded: February 1919 in Shanghai by the Society for the Promotion of the New Education (Hsin chiao-yü Kung-chin she 新教育*進社)

Ceased: October 1925

Remarks: An important periodical that advocated educational and intellecutual reforms. Its aim was to "introduce Western learning, so that under the stimulus of the new tide, our civilisation would accelerate in its rate of evolution." (8)

Weekly Review, Weekly (Hsing-ch'i p'ing-lun 星期評論)

Founded: June 8, 1919 in Shanghai, an organ of the Kuomintang.

Ceased: June 1920

Remarks: The magazine supported the May Fourth protests, and promoted nationalism, democracy and socialist ideas. It also criticised current politics and was opposed to warlordism.

Young China or "Journal of the Young China Association", monthly (Shao-nien Chung-kuo 少年中國)

Founded: July 1, 1919 in Peking by the Young China Association.

Ceased: May 1924

Remarks: The aim of the Young China Association was to "dedicate ourselves to the service of society under the guidance of the scientific spirit, to realise the ideal of creating a new China".(9) In the beginning, the magazine promoted generally democracy and science. From the early 1920s, however, the magazine contained divergent viewpoints of liberalism, nationalism, socialism and anarchism. This development reflects on similar divergencies among the members of the association.

Hsiang River Review, (Hsiang-chiang p'ing-lun 湘江評論)

Founded: July 14, 1919 in Changsha, by the Student Union of Hunan Province, edited by Mao Tse-tung.

Ceased: about August 11, 1919 (after four issues), suppressed together with the union, by the military governor of Hunan.

Remarks: The opening article of the magazine was penned by Mao, and the aim of the magazine given as "to promote the newest thought". But the magazine was in fact more closely modelled on the Weekly Critic, and went in for support of the students' cause and criticism of the government. The magazine was soon regarded by

Fu Ssu-nien, the editor of New Tide, as one of the best new periodicals in the country. Writing in September 1919, Fu named these periodicals as New Youth, "The Construction", Reconstruction, Young China, Weekly Critic and Hsiang River Review.(10) At the time, Mao was also not well-known nationally as a student activist. His long article, "The great union of the popular masses", published in the Review in July and August, in which Mao affirmed that the people of the world should unite together against a handful of "aristocrats and capitalists", was praised at the time by both the Weekly Critic and the New Tide as a valuable contribution to the movement.(11)

The Hsiang River Review's attack of the Hunan provincial government, in particular of the military governor, Chang Ching-yao, finally led to the banning of the magazine as well as the student union in mid-August 1919.(12)

"The Construction", monthly (Chien-she 建設)
Founded: Aug. 1, 1919 in Shanghai, an organ of the Kuomintang.
Ceased: late 1920
Remarks: Its editorial policy was similar to that of the Weekly Review, another organ of the Kuomintang. It advocated for the "reconstruction of state and society, reform of thought and institutions".

"The Emancipation and Reconstruction", (Chieh-fang yü kai-tso 解放與改造) from September 15, 1920, known as Reconstruction or "La Reconstruc", (Kai-tso 改造), first semimonthly, then monthly; in 1922 supplemented by a weekly.
Founded: Sept. 1, 1919 in Peking, an organ of the Progressive Party
Ceased: Sept. 15, 1922.
Remarks: The magazine supported the New Culture Movement. It later advocated guild socialism and the ideas of Russell, and suggested the socialism could only be achieved in China after capitalistic development.(see Chap. 3 Section 10)

Young World, monthly (Shao-nien shih-chieh 少年世界)
Founded: Jan. 1, 1920 in Shanghai, an organ of the Young China Association.
Ceased: Dec. 1920
Remarks: Young World was a short-lived though influential magazine that was noted for its surveys of various social problems.

Appendix C Periodicals Published by the Early Communist Groups and the Chinese Communist Party 1920 - 1926

The following periodicals are listed chronologically according to their respective dates of founding. The main sources used in this survey are the same as those for Appendix B, and additional sources will be individually noted.

World of Labour, Weekly, (Lao-tung Chieh 勞動界)
Founded: August 15, 1920, by the Shanghai Communist group.
Ceased: January 16, 1921.
Remarks: This was the first Communist organ that established a link with the labour movement, its aim was "to teach the Chinese workers what they should know about themselves". Edited by Ch'en Tu-hsiu during his sojourn in Shanghai, the contributors to this short-lived magazine included many of China's first Communists such as Ch'en Wang-tao, Chang Sung-nien, Yuan Chen-ying and Chang Kuo-t'ao, as well as many of the workers themselves.

It reported on the foreign and Chinese labour world, in particular the conditions of the "Chinese workers' struggle against capitalism and imperialism". The articles were written in simple language, and concentrated on drawing examples from real life. It emphasised that the workers must have their own unions which were not manipulated by the employers and the politicians. It was instrumental in setting up the Shanghai Machine-Workers' Unions (Shang-hai chi-ch'i kung-hui 上海機器工會), on which the Marxist intellectuals of the Shanghai Communist group were "honorary members".(1) But the magazine opposed political struggle, and emphasised that the workers' struggle should only be directed against securing higher wages and shorter working hours.

Chinese Communist historiography today criticises the magazine's "economism", and blames it on Ch'en Tu-hsiu's "right opportunism" in underestimating the consciousness of the workers. But it is noted that the magazine represented the first attempt by Marxist intellectuals to unite with the workers.

The Labourer, weekly, (Lao-tung che 勞動者)
Founded: October 3, 1920, by Canton Communist group.
Ceased: last surviving issue dated January 2, 1921
Remarks: Like World of Labour and the following Labour Clarion, it was a magazine published by one of the early Communist groups and aimed specifically at the workers. The editorial in the first issue called for the need for organisation among the workers, and asserted that the publication of the magazine was directed towards this end. It was also written in simple language, and carried reports on the workers' conditions and news of union activities. Many of the articles were unsigned It also carried the first known translation of "The International".

Chinese Communist historians criticise it for its tendencies towards anarchism and economism, and regard it as ideologically inferior to World of Labour.

Work-Mate, Weekly, later irregular, (Huo-yu 伙友)
Founded: October 10, 1920, by the Industrial & Commercial Friendship Union (Kung-shang yu-i hui 工商友誼會) in Shanghai, with the help of the New Youth Society. From June 1921, the magazine was known as Work-Mate Journal (Huo-yu pao 伙友報).
Ceased: Last surviving issue dated January 1, 1922.
Remarks: The Industrial & Commercial Friendship Union was organised with the help of the Shanghai Communist group, and its membership consisted in the main of shop-clerks. However, from December 1920 on, the Union broke away from the Communists, and the editorial direction of the magazine became more moderate.(2)

Labour Clarion, Weekly, (Lao-tung yin 勞働音)
Founded: November 7, 1920 (on the third anniversary of the October Revolution), by the Peking Communist group.
Ceased: Last surviving issue dated December 5, 1920.
Remarks: The editorial in the first issue criticised the Communist intellectuals at the time for just carrying out propaganda in Marxist theory to other intellectuals, and not engaging in concrete organisational work among the workers. The magazine believed that its publication would be the starting point for a concrete labour movement. It aimed to "widen the workers' knowledge and horizon". It reported on the workers' conditions, and seeked to establish contacts with them. Its readership consisted mostly of the railway workers at Chang-hsin-tien outside Peking, where Teng Chung-hsia and Chang Kuo-t'ao had started organisational activities in the spring of 1919. Compared with The Labourer, the magazine was less interested in teaching Marxist theory to workers, but was more concerned with organising strikes. It is criticised today by Chinese Communist historians for a tendency towards "adventurism".

Voice of Labour, Weekly, (Lao-tung sheng 勞動聲)
Founded: in 1920 by the Canton Communist group.
No further details available.

"The Communist", Monthly, but actually irregular, (Kung-ch'an tang 共產黨
Founded: November 7, 1920 (on the third anniversary of the October Revolution), as the official theoretical organ of the Shanghai Communist group.
Ceased: last surviving issue dated July 1921.
Remarks: It was a magazine for radical and Communist intellectuals, and is note[illegible] its discussion on the organisational aspect of the Communist movement. Most of the articles were either unsigned or under pseudonyms but the contributors possibly included Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Teng Chung-hsia, Yuan Chen-ying and Ssu Ts'un-t'ang.

As part of its discussion on the organisational aspect of the Communist movement, the magazine carried many translations of CPSU's materials on its work in mass organisations and the nature and organisation of a Communist party. It carried the first Chinese translation of Chapter 1 of Lenin's The State & Revolution. There were also reports on the work of the Comintern and the activities of various Communist parties abroad.

Today, the magazine is criticised by Chinese Communist historians on two points. The first is for its advocacy that the Chinese revolution should follow the form of the October Revolution of an armed urban insurrection led by workers. The second is for its compromising attitude towards anarchists and the suggestion that communism and anarchism shared the same goal of the overthrow of the capitalist system.

Labour Weekly, (Lao-tung chou-k'an 劳動周刊)

Founded: August 20, 1921 in Shanghai, by the Chinese Labour Union Secretariat.

Ceased: suppressed on June 9, 1922.

Remarks: The Secretariat was organised by the CCP shortly after its own founding to help with its organisation among the industrial workers. In its opening editorial, the magazine declared that it would serve as "avenue where the workers can air their grievances". The magazine reported on the working conditions of the workers, and offered guidance on the formation of their own unions that would be free of the control of the employers and the politicians. There were reports on the strikes of the workers, and like the workers' magazines published by the early Communist groups, many of the articles were written by the workers themselves.

This magazine was representative of a number of workers' magazines published by either the Secretariat or the CCP in the early 1920s. Among these were the Workers' Weekly (Chung-jen chou-k'an 工人周刊) published in Peking from May 1921, the Labour Weekly (Lao-tung chou-k'an 劳動周刊) published in Tsinan from May 1921, the Labour Weekly (Lao-tung chou-pao 劳動周报) published in Wuhan from December 1922, the Labour Weekly (Lao-tung chou-pao 劳動周报) published in Canton from April 1923, and the Chinese Worker (Chung-kuo kung-jen 中国工人) published in Shanghai from 1924. Although these magazines were all short-lived and had only a local circulation, they are today credited with helping to establish the first links between the party and the workers.

"The Pioneer", Semi-monthly, but actually irregular, (Hsien-chü 先驱)

Founded: January 15, 1922 in Peking, by the Socialist Youth Corps.

Ceased: The magazine was suppressed by the Peiyang warlords after its twenty-fifth issue was published on August 15, 1923.

Remarks: The Socialist Youth Corps (She-hui chu-i ch'ing-nien t'uan 社会主义青年团) was first organised in August 1920 by the Shanghai Communist group, and by the end of the year, the Communist groups in the other cities had established their own Corps. Up to May 1921, the Corps was in fact quite disorganised and inactive, and its

members included Marxists, anarchists, guild socialists and syndicalists. Following the founding of the CCP, the Corps was reorganised in November into a purely Marxist organisation, and the magazine was established in the following January. At first it was published by the Peking unit of the Corps; but it was frequently harrassed and finally suppressed by the authorities.(3) From May 1922, it was produced by the Central Executive Committee of the Corps.

In its opening editorial, the magazine declared that its aim was to "raise the people's consciousness, and study the objective conditions in China and the foreign socialist movements". The magazine was noted for its concentration on the youth movements in China, and in particular helped to expand the Corps. Its contributors included Sou Ts'un-t'ung, Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Tai Chi-t'ao, Ts'ai Ho-sen, Li Ta and Teng Chung-hsia. Following its suppression in August 1923, the Corps decided to start another magazine, and this was Chinese Youth which was founded in October of the same year. (See following)

Today, the magazine is credited by Chinese Communist historians for its work in the youth movements, but is criticised for its neglect of young workers and its failure to link Marxist theory to the actual situation.

"Guide Weekly", (Hsiang-tao chou-pao 嚮導周報)

Founded: September 13, 1922, by the Chinese Communist Party.

Ceased: July, 1927.

Remarks: The decision to publish the magazine was taken at the Second Congress held in Canton in mid-1922. Designated as "the official organ of the Central Committee", it was more involved with the struggle of the party in the 1920s than the theoretical journal that was HCN. (See Chapter 4 Section2) The aims of the magazine, as declared in its manifesto published in the first issue, were anti-imperialism, anti-warlordism and the country's unification.

With respect to the first aim, the magazine carried analyses of the history and nature of imperialism, and in particular stressed that it was American, British Japanese imperialism that were responsible for the degradation of China. From May 1925, it carried a "Daily Record of the Foreign Scourge" column (Wai-huan jih-chih 外患日誌) in which it gave specific instances of imperialist intrusion in China.. It condemned warlordism as a tool of the imperialists, and that the defeat of the warlords was essential to the unification of the country. During the period of collaboration with the Kuomintang, its editorial position followed the official line that the national movement consisted of a united front of workers, peasants, petty and national bourgeoisie against imperialism and warlordism. The nature and progress of the Northern Expedition were also discussed in it pages.

Thus the magazine was much more directly concerned with the revolutionary situation than was HCN. One could infer that there was a division of labour between the two. For example, from the time when Guide Weekly was founded to the time when HCN ceased publication, while HCN carried translations of eight Leninist tracts, Guide Weekly did not carry any.(4) But, given the political activism of the 1920s, Guide Weekly can be regarded as

the more important of the two for the party's work. One indication of this was that, despite the fact that the magazine was a semi-open publication and had to move from Shanghai to Canton in the course of its publication, its circulation rose from 20,000 in December 1924 to 50,000 in July 1926.(5) Although there are no comparable figures available for HCR, it could not have been as successfull, as indicated by its drastic fall in publication frequency in this period.

In Chinese Communist historiography, Guide Weekly is credited for its anti-imperialism and anti-warlordism, and for raising the people's consciousness, particularly at the time of the May 30th Movement in 1925 and the Northern Expedition in 1926. However, it is also criticised for certain ideological shortcomings, such as the "right opportunism" of Ch'en Tu-hsiu manifested in its pages.

Vanguard, Monthly, (Ch'ien-feng 前鋒)

Founded: July 1, 1923 in Canton.

Ceased: last surviving issue dated 1924.

Remarks: In its opening editorial, the magazine declared that it would position itself on the front-line of the anti-imperialist and anti-warlord struggle. But it was a periodical of limited importance. Contributors included Ts'ai Ho-jen and Mao Tse-min 毛澤民, respectively Mao's old school-friend and younger brother.(6)

Chinese Youth, Weekly, (Chung-kuo ch'ing-nien 中國青年)

Founded: October 20, 1923, by the Socialist Youth Corps as the successor to the suppressed Pioneer.

Remarks: In its opening editorial, the magazine declared that its aim was "to lead the youth of the country on to a realistic road and to teach them practical knowledge so that they can lead the masses". The magazine was published in Shanghai. It was suppressed during Chiang Kai-shek's putsch in April 1927. It was later revived briefly in Yenan in 1939-1940. In December 1948 it was revived again as the organ of the Chinese New Democratic Youth Corps (Chung-kuo hsin min-chu chu-i ch'ing-nien t'uan 中國新民主主義青年團)

Appendix D. The Manifesto of New Youth Magazine, published on December 1, 1919. (HCN, volume 7 number 1, pp.1-4).

The viewpoint of our magazine has never been published in its entirety. The standpoints of the members of the society (i.e. New Youth Society) have very often not been identical. This may naturally create doubt among our readers, or create misunderstanding in society. We now take this opportunity, at the start of volume 7, to pronounce clearly the common opinion of all the members of the society. Those who will be joining the society will have the duty of adhering to this manifesto. Excluded from this is the "Readers' Forum" column which is designed for carrying opinions different from that of the society.

We believe that militarism and mammonism in the world have already created countless crimes, and that it is the time to reject them.

We believe that the old viewpoints in the politics, morals and economics of all countries in the world contain many elements that both hamper progress and are unreasonable. If we want social progress, then we must destroy prejudices that are thought of as "unalterable truths" or as "established from old". We are determined, on the one hand to reject such old viewpoints, and on the other to combine the thoughts of ancient and contemporary thinkers and of our own, to create a new viewpoint in politics, morals and economics, and to raise high the spirit of the new era, so that we can adapt to the environment of the new society.

Our ideal new era and new society are to be honest, progressive, positive, free, egalitarian, creative, beautiful, virtuous, peaceful, full of mutual love and cooperation, hard-working, happy, and of benefit to all. We hope that all the hypocritical, conservative, negative, restrictive, class-divided, conventional, ugly, evil, warring, restless, idle and unhappy phenomena, as well as happiness for the few -- will all gradually diminish and then disappear.

The new youth in our new society will certainly respect labour. Labour will, according to the ability and interest of the individual, be regarded as something that is free, happy, artistic and beautiful. A sacred thing should not be regarded as a requisite for making a living.

We believe that the development of human morals should go beyond a life based on impulses (i.e. aggressiveness and possessiveness). (Parenthesis in the original) Therefore, we should show feelings of friendship and cooperation towards every people in the world. But we must be hostile to the aggressive and possessive warlords and mammonists.

We advocate mass movements and social reconstruction. We advocate having no relations at all with past and present political factions and parties.

Although we do not believe in the omnipotence of politics, we accept that politics is an important aspect of public life. We also believe that genuine democratic politics will certainly share out political power to the entire people. If there be any limits, they will be based on the criteria whether somebody works or not, and not whether he has any wealth. This kind of politics is an essential stage in the creation of the new era, and also a useful tool in the development of the new society. As for political parties, we recognise that they are a necessary method in the conduct of politics. But we will never join these political parties who merely safeguard the interests of the minority, or of a certain class, and never give consideration to the happiness of the whole society.

We believe that politics, morals, science, arts, religion and education should all be squarely based on the real needs of the development of present and future social life.

It is because we want to create literature and morals that will meet the needs of the creation of the social life in the new era and the new society, that we have to reject the unsuitable elements in the conventional literature and morals.

We believe that the promotion of natural sciences and the pragmatic philosophy, and the destruction of superstition and fallacies, are the prerequisites for progress in our present society.

We believe that respect for the female personality and for women's rights is already a real need for progress in our present social life. We also hope that they (the women) themselves are thoroughly aware of their social responsibility.

Because we want to realise our proposals and to strengthen our position, we welcome thoughtful and faithful criticism, and not thoughtless and faithless agreement. But until the opposition have sufficient reasons to convince us, we will of course bravely and determinedly propagate our proposals. We reject the hypo-critical, the confusing, that which induces lethargy, that which hampers progress, and any groundless proposals for compromise. We also reject the nihilistic, the vague, the faithless, that which lacks proposals, the impractical, and useless absolute scepticism.

Appendix E. The dates of publication of HCN

CHÊNG-NIEN TSA-CHIH

VOLUME 1.	NUMBER 1.	September 15th,	1915.
	2.	October 15th,	" .
	3.	November 15th,	" .
	4.	December 15th,	" .
	5.	January	1916.
	6.	February 15th,	" .

HSIN CH'ING-NIEN (Monthly)

VOLUME 2.	NUMBER 1.	September 1st,	1916.
	2.	October 1st,	" .
	3.	November 1st,	" .
	4.	December 1st,	" .
	5.	January 1st,	1917.
	6.	February 1st,	" .
VOLUME 3.	NUMBER 1.	March 1st,	1917.
	2.	April 1st,	" .
	3.	May 1st,	" .
	4.	June 1st,	" .
	5.	July 1st,	" .
	6.	August 1st,	" .
VOLUME 4.	NUMBER 1.	January 15th,	1918.
	2.	February 15th,	" .
	3.	March 15th,	" .
	4.	April 15th,	" .
	5.	May 15th,	" .
	6.	June 15th,	" .
VOLUME 5.	NUMBER 1.	July 15th,	1918.
	2.	August 15th,	" .
	3.	September 15th,	" .
	4.	October 15th,	" .
	5.	November 15th,	" .
	6.	December 15th,	" .
VOLUME 6.	NUMBER 1.	January 15th,	1919.
	2.	February 15th,	" .
	3.	March 15th,	" .
	4.	April 15th,	" .
	5.	May	" .
	6.	November 1st,	" .
VOLUME 7.	NUMBER 1.	Decemeber 1st,	1919.
	2.	January 1st,	1920.
	3.	February 1st,	" .
	4.	March 1st,	" .
	5.	April 1st,	" .
	6.	May 1st,	" .
VOLUME 8.	NUMBER 1.	September 1st,	1920.
	2.	October 1st,	" .
	3.	November 1st,	" .
	4.	December 1st,	" .
	5.	January 1st,	1921.
	6.	April 1st,	" .

VOLUME 9. NUMBER 1. May 1st, 1921.
2. June 1st, " .
3. July 1st, " .
4. August 1st, " .
5. September 1st, " .
6. July 1st, 1922.

HSIN CH'ING-NIEN (Quarterly Numbers)

NUMBER 1. June 15th, 1923.
2. December 20th, " .
3. August 1st, 1924.
4. December 20th, " .

HSIN CH'ING-NIEN (Irregular Numbers)

NUMBER 1. April 22nd, 1925.
2. June 1st, " .
3. March 25th, 1926.
4. May 25th, " .
5. July 25th, " .

NOTES

Full details of a source are given in the note where it is first referred to. In subsequent references, the underlined Arabic numerals immediately following an author's or editor's name, or the title of the source (when there is no given author or editor), refer to the number of the source as listed in the bibliography. The Chinese characters in the details of a source that is not included in the bibliography, are given in the note where it first occurs.

Chapter 1. The Background In Which HCN Was Founded.

1. Li Chien-nung, The Political History of China, 1840-1928, translated and edited by Ssu-yu Teng and Jeremy Ingalls, (Stanford U. Press, 1956), pp.376-384.
2. Ibid, pp.390-391.
3. Hung Huan-ch'un, Wu-ssu shi-ch'i ti Chung-kuo ko-ming yün-tung (The Chinese Revolutionary Movement in the May Fourth period) (Peking, 1956), pp.4-20.
4. For a description of the various social groups in Chinese society in the 1900-1913 period, see Mary C. Wright, "Introduction: the Rising Tide of Change", in Mary C. Wright, ed. China in Revolution: the First Phase, 1900-1913 (Yale U. Press, 1968), pp.30-44.
5. Ibid, pp.60-63.
6. Figure from the Ministry of Education, Peking Government, Statistical Tables and Charts of the Fifth Survey of Education, cited in Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement (Stanford U. Press, 1960), p.379.
7. Lo Chia-lun, "Chin-jih Chung-kuo chih tsa-chih chieh" (The world of Chinese magazines today), Hsin ch'ao, Vol.1, No.4 (April 1, 1919), pp.625-634.
8. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, pp.43,45.
9. Chow Tse-tsung, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement (Stanford U. Press, 1963), p.27.
10. Ibid, p.27.
11. Ibid, p.28.
12. Ibid, p.124.

13. Hu Shih, "Kuei-kuo tsa-kan" (Miscellaneous thoughts on returning to China), HCN 4/1 (Jan.15, 1918), p.22.
14. Ko Kung-chen, Chung-kuo pao-hsüeh shih (A history of Chinese journalism), 2nd eiditon (Shanghai, 1927), pp.181-184.
15. The description of these newspapers is based on Chow Tse-tung, 267, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, pp.125-129.
16. Li Lung-mu, "Lun Wu-ssu shih-ch'i pao-k'an kung-tso ti kai-ko" (On the reform of the work in periodicals in the May Fourth period), in Shang-hai che-hsüeh she-hui k'o-hsüeh hsüeh-hui (Shang-hai Philosophical & Social Sciences Association), ed. Chi-nien Wu-ssu yün-tung ssu-shih chou-nien lun-wen chi (Collection of essays in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth movement) (Shanghai, 1960), p.79.
17. Li Chien-nung 李劍農, "Hsien-fa shang ti yen-lun ch'u-pan tzu-yu ch'üan" 憲法上的言論出版自權 (The right of freedom of speech and publication in the Chinese constitution), T'ai-p'ing-yang 太平洋 (Pacific Ocean), Vol.2 No.1 (May 5, 1920), p.3.
18. Kao I-han, "Tui-yü chih-an ching-ch'a t'iao-li ti p'i-p'ing" (A criticism of the security and police regulations), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.15-23.
19. Ko Kung-chen, 154, A history of Chinese journalism, Chap.6, Section 17.
20. Li Chien-nung, "The right of freedom of speech and publication in the Chinese constitution", op.cit., pp.3-5.
21. "Pien-chi shih tsa-chi" (Miscellaneous notes from the editorial office), HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), p.2.

Chapter 3. The Liberal-bourgeois Phase of HCN, September 1915-April 1919.

1. Wang Shen-jan, Chin-tai erh-shih chia p'ing-ch'uan (Critical biographies of twenty modern Chinese) (Peking, 1934), pp.250-251.
2. Ts'ao chu-jen, Wen-t'an wu-shih nien (Fifty years in the literary world) (Hong Kong, 1955), p.98.
3. "Correspondence" column in HCN 2/1 (Sept.1, 1916), p.7.
4. "Correspondence" column in HCN 5/6 (Dec. 15, 1918), p.635.

5. Chang Chih-lu, compiled, Chung-kuo chin-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao (Source materials for the history of modern Chinese publishing), Erh-pien (Part 2) (Shanghai, 1954), p. 315.
6. Kiang Wen-han, The Chinese Student Movement (New York, 1948), p.23.
7. HCN 5/6 (December 15, 1918), p.647.
8. HCN 7/2 (January 1, 1920), p.190.
9. Li Lung-mu, "Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ch'uan-po Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i ti ch'ung yao K'an-wu: Hsin ch'ing-nien" (New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period), in Chung-kung Chung-yang Ma-En Lieh-Ssu chu-tso pien-i chü (Bureau for the Compilation & Translation of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin & Stalin, Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party), ed. Wu-ssu ch'i-k'an chieh-shao (An introduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth period), Vol. 1, p.12.
10. Hu Shih, translated "Chüeh-tou" 決鬥 (The Duel), HCN 2/1 (September 1, 1916), pp.1-6.
11. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/2 (October 1, 1916) pp.1-3.
12. Ibid, pp. 3-4.
13. Hu Shih, "Wen-hsüeh kai-liang ch'u-i" (Tentative proposals for literary reform), HCN 2/5 (Jan. 1, 1917), pp.1-11.
14. Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, "Wo tsai Pei-ching ta-hsüeh ti ching-li" (My experiences in Peking University), Tung-fang tsa-chih (Eastern Miscellany), pp. 5-7. Also see Kiang Wen-han, 290, The Chinese Student Movement, p.26.
15. T'ao Meng-ho (T'ao Li-kung), "Jen-lei wen-hua chih ch'i-yüan (The origins of human civilisation), in three parts, HCN 2/5 (Jan. 1 1917), 2/6 (Feb. 1. 1917) and 3/1 (Mar.1, 1917).
16. "Correspondence" column HCN 2/5 (Jan. 1 1917), pp. 3-4
17. "Correspondence" column HCN 3/1 (Mar. 1. 1917), pp. 7-10
18. "Correspondence" column in HCN 2/6 (February 1, 1917), pp.12-13, 3/1 (Mar. 1, 1917), pp. 1-7, 3/3 (May 1, 1917), pp. 14-17, 3/4 (June 1, 1917), pp. 1-6, 3/5 (July 1, 1917) pp. 8-13, 3/6 (Aug. 1. 1917), pp. 5-12. 14-21.
19. Lu Hsün, selected Works (Peking, 1959) Vol. 3, p. 230
20. Yang Chih-hua, ed. Wen-t'an shih-liao (Historical Materials on the Literary World) (Shanghai, 1944) p. 360.
21. "Correspondence" column HCN 3/3 (Sept. 15, 1918), p.306.
22. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ai-kuo-hsin yü tzu-chüeh-hsin" (Patriotism and Self-consciousness) in Chia-yin tsa-chih (Tiger Magazine) vol. 1, No. 4 (1915), pp. 1-6.

23. "Correspondence" column, HCN 3/2 (April 1, 1917), p.3.
24. "Ch'ing-nien tsa-chih she-kao" 青年雜誌社告 (The Manifesto of the Youth Magazine), dated September 15, 1915 and reproduced in Chung-kung Chung-yang Ma-En-Lieh-Ssu chu-tso pien-i chü (Bureau for the Compilation & Translation of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin & Stalin, Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party), ed. Wu-ssu shi-ch'i ch'i-k'an chieh-shao (An introduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth period), Vol.1 (Peking, 1958), p.382.
25. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/1 (September 1, 1916), p.3.
26. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ching-kao ch'ing-nien" (Call to youth), HCN 1/1 (Sept. 15, 1915), p.2.
27. Ibid, pp.2-6.
28. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "I-chiu-i-liu nien" (The year 1916), HCN 1/5 (Jan. 1916), p.2.
29. Kao I-han, "Kung-ho kuo-chia yü ch'ing-nien chih tzu-chüeh" (The republic and the self-awareness of youth), HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915), p.1.
30. "Correspondence column, HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915), p.2.
31. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Chiu ssu-hsiang yü kuo-ti wen-t'i" (The old thought and the question of state-form), HCN 3/3 (May 1, 1917), p.2.
32. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/1 (Sept.1, 1916), p.3.
33. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Wu-jen chih tsui-hou chüeh-wu" (Our final awakening), HCN 1/6 (Feb.15, 1916), p.3.
34. Ibid, pp.3-4.
35. Jerome Grieder, Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance (Harvard U. Press, 1970), p.176.
36. Ibid, p.176.
37. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 22, "Our final awakening", p.4.
38. "Correspondence" column, 2/5 (Jan.1, 1917), pp.3-4.
39. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 16, "Call to youth", p.1.
40. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Fa-lan-hsi-jen yü chin-tai wen-ming" (The French and contemporary civilisation), HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915), p.1.
41. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Tung-Hsi min-tsu ken-pen ssu-hsiang chih ch'a-i" (Differences between the basic ideas of the Eastern and Western peoples), HCN 1/4 (Dec.15, 1915), pp.1-4.
42. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Chin-tai Hsi-yang chiao-yü " (Contemporary Western education), HCN 3/5 (July 1, 1917), p.4.

43. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 21, "The year 1916", p.3.
44. Yi Pa-sha, "K'ung-tzu p'ing-i" (A discussion of Confucius), HCN 1/6 (Feb.15, 1916), pp.1-6.
45. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 22, "Our final awakening", p.4.
46. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "K'ung-tzu chih tao yü hsien-tai sheng-huo" (The way of Confucius and contemporary life), HCN 2/4 (Dec.1, 1916), p.5.
47. Wu Yü, "Chia-tsu chih-tu wei chuan-chih chu-i chih ken-chü lun" (On the family and clan system as the basis of despotism), HCN 2/6 (Feb.1, 1917), pp.1-4.
48. Wu Yü, "Ju-chia chu-chang chieh-chi chih-tu chih hai" (The harm of the Confucianists' advocacy of the class system), HCN 3/4 (June 1, 1917), p.1.
49. Lu Hsün, "K'uang-jen jih-chi (Diary of a madman), HCN 4/5 (May 15, 1918), pp.416-417.
50. Ibid, p.424.
51. Lu Hsün, "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 5/5 (November 15, 1918), p.513.
52. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 16, "Call to youth", p.6.
53. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Yu-kuei lun chih-yi" (Doubts on the existence of ghosts), HCN 4/5 (May 15, 1918), pp.408-409.
54. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ou-hsiang p'o-huai lun" (On iconoclasm), HCN 5/2 (Aug.15, 1918).p.89.
55. Ibid, p.101.
56. See Liu Yen-ling 劉延陵, "Chieh-hun chih kuo-ch'ü hsien-tsai mei-lai" 結婚之過去現在未來(Marriage: the past, the present and the future), HCN 3/6 (Aug.1, 1917), pp.1-4; Hua Lin 華林, "She-hui yü fu-nü chieh-fang wen-t'i" 社會與婦女解放問題 (Society and the question of women's liberation), HCN 5/2 (Aug. 15, 1918), pp.161-162.
57. "Correspondence" column, HCN 5/2 (Aug.15, 1918), p.307.
58. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Hsien-fa yü k'ung-chiao" (The constitution and Confucianism), HCN 2/3 (Nov.1, 1916), p.1.
59. Ibid, p.5.
60. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 17, "The French and contemporary civilisation", p.1.
61. Kao I-han, 142, "The republic and the self-awareness of youth), p.1.
62. Kao I-han, "Chin-shih kuo-chia kuan-nien yü ku hsiang-i chi kai-lüeh" (An overview of the similarities and differences between the ancient and modern view of the state), HCN 1/2 (Oct.15, 1915), pp.1-10
63. Kao I-han, "Min-yüeh yü pang-pen" (The social contract and the state), HCN 1/3 (Nov. 15, 1915), pp.1-6.

64. Kao I-han translated, "Tai-hsüeh Yin-kuo yen-lun tzu-yu chih ch'üan-li lun" (A.V.Dicey's discussion of the right to freedom of speech in Britain), HCN 1/6 (Feb.15, 1916), pp.1-3.
65. Kao I-han, "Ssu-pin-sai-erh ti cheng-chih che-hsüeh" (Spencer's political philosophy), HCN 6/3 (Mar.15, 1919), pp.254-265; also Kao I-han translated, "Hsüan-chü-ch'üan li-lun shang ti ken-chü"選舉權理論上的根據(The theoretical basis of the franchise), HCN 6/4 (April 15, 1919), pp.385-391.
66. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 21, "The year 1916", pp.2-3.
67. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 20, "Diffreences between the basic ideas of the Eastern and Western peoples", p.2.
68. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Jen-sheng chen-i" (The true meaning of life), HCN 4/2 (Feb.15, 1918), pp.92-93.
69. Hu Shih, "I-pu-sheng chu-i" (Ibsenism), HCN 4/6 (June 15, 1918), p.502.
70. Liu Shu-ya, translated "Chin-shih ssu-hsiang chung chih k'o-hsüeh ching-shen" (The scientific spirit in contemporary thought), HCN 1/3 (Nov.15, 1915), p.1.
71. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Tang-tai erh-ta k'o-hsüeh-chia chih ssu-hsiang" (The thoughts of two great contemporary scientists), HCN 2/1 (Sept. 1, 1916), p.1.
72. Wu Chih-hui, "Ch'ing-nien yü kung-chü" (Youth and tools), HCN 2/2 (Oct.1, 1916), pp.1-6.
73. Hu Shih, "Chieh-shao wo tzu-chi ti ssu-hsiang" 介紹我自己的思想 (An introduction to my own own thought), in Hu Shih, Hu Shih wen-hsüan (Selected works of Hu Shih) (Taipeh, 1968), p.2.
74. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Chin-jih chih chiao-yü fang-chen" (Principles of education today), HCN 1/2 (Oct. 15, 1915), p.3.
75. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 20, "Contemporary Western education", p.4.
76. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 16, "Call to youth", p.5.
77. Kao I-han, "Lo-li chu-i yü jen-sheng" (Utilitarianism and life), HCN 2/1 (Sept. 1, 1916), p.6.
78. Hu Shih, "Ts'ang-hui shih cha-chi" (Notes from the Ts'ang-hui Room), first extract appeared in HCN 2/4 (Dec.1, 1916), and the next ten extracts appeared irregularly with the last one appearing in 5/3 (Sept. 15, 1918).
79. Ch'en Ku 陳嘏, translated, "Ch'un-ch'ao" 春潮 (Spring Floods), HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915) and the following three issues. Also Hsüeh Ch'i-ying 薛琪瑛, transalted "I-chung jen" 意中人 (An Ideal Husband), HCN 1/2 (Oct.15, 1915) and the following issues.
80. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Hsien-tai Ou-chou wen-i shih t'an" (A discussion

of the history of contemporary European literature), HCN 1/3 (Nov. 15, 1915), p.1.

81. "Correspondence" column, HCN 1/4 (Dec. 15, 1915), p.2.

82. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/2 (Oct.1, 1916), p.2.

83. Ibid, pp.2-3.

84. Ibid, pp.3-4.

85. Hu Shih, "Wen-hsüeh kai-liang ch'u-i" (Tentative proposals for literary reform), HCN 2/5 (Jan.1, 1917), p.10.

86. Ibid, p.11.

87. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Wen-hsüeh ko-ming lun" (On literary revolution), HCN 2/6 (Feb.1, 1917), p.1.

88. Liu Fu, "Wo-chih wen-hsüeh kai-liang kuan" (My view on literary reform), HCN 3/3 (May 1, 1917), pp.1-13.

89. "Correspondence" column, HCN 3/1 (Mar.1, 1917), p.7.

90. Mentioned by Hu Shih in "Correspondence" column, HCN 3/3 (May 1, 1917), p.4.

91. Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸, "Tao-yen" 導言 (Introduction), in Cheng Chen-to, compiled, Wen-hsüeh lun-cheng chi 文學論爭集 (Anthology of essays concerning the literary revolution), in Chao Chia-pi, ed. Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi (A corpus of Chinese new literature), Vol.2 (Shanghai, 1935), p.5.

92. Wang Ching-hsüan 王敬軒, "Wen-hsüeh ko-ming chih fan-hsiang" 文學革命之反響 (A reaction to the literary revolution), "Correspondence" column, HCN 4/3 (Mar. 15, 1918), pp.265-268.

93. Liu Fu, reply to Wang Ch'ing-hsüan, "Correspondence" column, HCN 4/3 (Mar. 15, 1918), pp.268-285.

94. Hu Shih, "Chien-she ti wen-hsüeh ko-ming lun" (On a constructive literary revolution), HCN 4/4 (Apr. 15, 1918), p.289.

95. Chung-mi 仲密 (pen-name of Chou Tso-jen), "Ssu-hsiang ko-ming" (Revolution in thought), HCN 6/4 (Apr.15, 1919), pp.396-397.

96. For an assessment of Sun's interest in socialist ideas, see Martin Bernal, "Chinese Socialism before 1913", in Jack Gray, ed. Modern China's Search for a Political Form (Oxford U. Press, 1969), pp.75-84.

97. For a description of the Chinese Socialist Party, see ibid, pp.89-95. For a Chinese Communist view of the pre-1917 interest in socialist ideas in China, see Li Shu, Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i yü Chung-kuo ko-ming (Marxism and the Chinese revolution) (Peking, 1963), pp.76-92.

98. Jung Meng-yüan, "Hsin-hai ko-ming ch'ien Chung-kuo shu-k'an shang tui Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i ti chieh-shao" (The introduction of Marxism

in Chinese publications before the 1911 Revolution), Hsin chien-she (New Construction), No.3, 1953 (Peking), pp.5-12.

99. Chang Ching-lu compiled, Chung-kuo ch'u-pan shih-liao pu-pien (Supplementary source materials for the history of Chinese publishing) (Peking, 1957), p.442.

100. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 17."The French and contemporary civilisation", pp.2-3.

101. "Kuo-wai ta-shih chi" 國外大事記 (Record of foreign affairs), HCN 3/2 (Apr. 1, 1917), pp.1-5.

102. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 26, "The way of Confucius and contemporary life", p.3.

103. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/5 (Jan.1, 1917), p.5.

104. Li Ta-chao, "Ch'ing-nien yü lao-jen" (Young and old people), HCN 3/2 (April 1, 1917), p.1.

105. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "O-lu-ssu ko-ming yü wo-kuo-min chih chüeh-wu" (The Russian Revolution and the awakening of our countrymen), HCN 3/2 (Apr. 1, 1917), pp.1-2.

106. Ibid, p.2.

107. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "K'e-lin-te pei" (The Von Ketteler Monument), HCN 5/5 (Nov. 15, 1918), p.458. The monument was erected to commemorate the German minister Freiherr von Ketteler, who was killed by the Boxers in 1900.)

108. Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, "Lao-kung shen-sheng" (The sacredness of labour), HCN 5/5 (Nov. 15, 1918), p.439.

109. Chou Tso-jen, "Jih-pen ti Hsin-ts'un" (The New Village of Japan), HCN 6/3 (Mar. 15, 1919), p.266.

110. Wang Kuang-ch'i, "Kung-tso yü jen-sheng" (Work and life), HCN 6/4 (April 15, 1919), p.379.

111. Li Lung-mu, "Li ta-chao t'ung-chih ho Wu-ssu shih-ch'i Ma-k'e-ssu-chu-i ssu-hsiang ti hsüan-ch'uan" (Comrade Li Ta-chao and the propagation of Marxist thought during the May Fourth period), Li-shih yen-chiu (Historical Research), No.5, 1957 (Peking), p.4.

112. Li Ta-chao, "Ch'ing-ch'un" (Spring), HCN 2/1 (Sept.1, 1916), p.6 .

113. Li Ta-chao, "O-kuo ta ko-ming chih ying-hsiang" (The influence of the great Russian Revolution), dated March 1917, in Li Ta-chao hsüan-chi (Selected writings of Li Ta-chao) (Peking, 1959), pp.81-82.

114. Ibid, p.81.

115. Li Ta-chao, "Chin" (The present), HCN 4/4 (April 15, 1918), p.310.

116. Li Ta-chao, "Hsin-ti! chiu-ti!" (The new! the old!), HCN 4/5 (May 15, 1918), p.448.

117. Li Ta-chao, "Fa-O ko-ming chih pi-chiao kuan" (A comparative view of the French and Russian revolutions), dated July 1918, in Shih Tsün, ed. Chung-kuo chin-tai ssu-hsiang shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao chien-pien (Collection of materials on the history of modern Chinese thought) (Peking, 1957), p.1202.

118. Li Ta-chao, "Shu-min ti sheng-li" (Victory of the common people), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), p.437.

119. Ibid.

120. Li Ta-chao, "Bolshevism ti sheng-li" (The victory of Bolshevism), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.444-445.

121. Ibid, p.448.

122. Maurice Meisner, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism (Harvard U. Press, 1967), p.72.

123. Li Jui, Mao Tse-tung t'ung-chih ti ch'u-ch'i ko-ming huo-tung (The early revolutionary activities of Comrade Mao Tse-tung) (Peking, 1957), p.68.

124. Edgar Snow, Red Star Over China, first revised and enlarged edition (London, 1972), pp.182-183.

125. Li Ta-chao, "Chan-hou chih fu-jen wen-t'i" (The post-war women question), HCN 6/2 (Feb.15, 1919), p.146.

126. "Correspondence" column, HCN 5/6 (Dec.15, 1918), pp.629-630.

127. Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung, "Correspondence" column, HCN 6/2 (Feb. 15, 1919), p.229.

128. See for example HCN 3/6 (Aug. 1, 1917), pp.1-2 on studying in England; and HCN 4/2 (Feb.15, 1918), p.150 on studying in Europe in general.

129. See "Readers' Forum" column, HCN 4/1 (Jan.15, 1918), pp.62-74.

130. Hu Shih, introduction to the "What Nonsense" column, HCN 5/4 (Oct.15, 1918), p.435.

131. See for example the "Introduction to Books and Magazines" (Shu-pao chieh-shao 書報介紹) column, HCN 3/2 (April 1, 1917), 3/3 (May 1, 1917) and 3/4 (June 1, 1917).

132. See "Pei-ching liu-Fa chien-hsüeh hui chien-chang" 北京留法儉學會簡章 (Prospectus of Peking's Frugal Study in France Association), HCN 3/2 (April 1, 1917); and "Pei-ching ta-hsüeh t'ung-hsüeh chien-hsüeh hui ch'i" 北京大學同學儉學會啓 (An announcement from the Frugal Study Association of the Students of Peking University), HCN 3/4 (June 1, 1917).

133. Lo Chia-lun, [illegible], "The world of Chinese magazines today), p.631.

134. "Correspondence"column, HCN 1/4 (Dec. 15, 1915), p.2.

135. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/1 (Sept. 1, 1916), p.6.

136. "Correspondence" column, HCN 2/5 (Jan.1, 1917), p.6.

Chap. 2 The Liberal-Bourgeois Phase of HCN.

137. "Correspondence" column, HCN 5/6 (Dec. 15, 1918), p.632.

138. Pa Chin 巴金, Chia 家 (Family) (Hong Kong, 1965), pp.32-33.

139. Edgar Snow, 315, Red Star Over China, p.174.

140. Erh-shih-pa-hua Sheng, "Ti-yü chih yen-chiu" (A study of physical education), HCN 3/2 (Apr.1, 1917), p.1-11. For a part translation of Mao's article, see Stuart R. Schram, The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung, enlarged and revised edition (London, 1969), pp.152-160.

141. Edgar Snow, 315, p.87, p.311.

142. Hua Kang, Wu-ssu yün-tung shih (A history of the May Fourth Movement) (Wuhan, 1952), p.112.

143. Ts'ao Chu-jen, 238, Fifty years in the literary world, pp.99-100.

144. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Pen-chih tsui-an ta-pien shu" (In answer to the charges against the magazine), HCN 6/1 (Jan. 15, 1919), p.10.

145. Ching-kuan 靜觀, "Kuo-li Pei-ching ta-hsüeh chih nei-jung" 國立北京大學之內容 (The situation in the National University of Peking), Tung-fang tsa-chih 東方雜誌 (Eastern Miscellany), Vol.16 No.3 (Mar. 15, 1919), p.165.

146. Chow Tse-tsung, 269, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, pp.44-45.

147. Lin Shu, "Ching-sheng" (Ching-sheng), reprinted in Hu Shih, ed. Chien-she li-lun chi 建設理論集 (A collection of essays concerning the construction of the new literature), in Chao Chia-pi, ed. 13, A corpus of Chinese new literature, Vol.1, pp.174-175.

148. Lin Shu, "Chih Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei shu" 致蔡元培書 (A letter to Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei), dated Mar.18, 1919, cited by Chow Tse-tung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, pp.68-69.

149. Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, "Chih Kung-yen pao ta Lin Ch'in-nan han" (Letter to the Public Opinion Daily and in answer to Lin Ch'in-nan (Lin Shu)), reprinted in Hsin ch'ao she (New Tide Society), ed. Ts'ai Chieh-min hsien-sheng yen-hsing lu (The life and works of Mr. Ts'ai Chieh-min (Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei)), Vol.2 (Peking, 1920), pp.314-315.

150. For the partial text of the letter of the Ministry of Education and Ts'ai's reply, see Yin Fa-lu 陰法魯, "Pei-yang chün-fa tui chin-pu k'an-wu ti ts'ui-ts'an" 北洋軍閥對進步刊物的摧殘 (The Peiyang warlords' suppression of progressive periodicals), in Hua-chung kung-hsüeh-yüan Ma-k'o-ssu Lieh-ning chu-i tzu-liao shih (Reference Section on Marxism-Leninism, Central China Technical College), ed. Wu-ssu yün-tung wen-chi (A collection of essays on the May Fourth Movement) (Wuhan, 1957), p.95.

151. Ibid.

152. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Kuan-yü Pei-ching ta-hsüeh ti yao-yen" 關於北京大學的謠言(Rumaours concerning Peking University), dated Mar. 16, 1919, in Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Tu-hsiu wen-ts'un (Collected works of Ch'en Tu-hsiu), pp.601-605.

153. This directive was reprinted in the "What Nonsense" column, HCN 6/4 (Apr.15, 1919), p.446.

154. Hu Shih, foreword to the photo-fascimile edition of HCN (Daian Company, Tokyo, 1962), Volume 1, p.4.

155. Benjamin Schwartz, "The Intelligentsia in Communist China", Daedalus (Summer, 1960), p.613.

156. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 21, "The year 1916", p.4.

157. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Fei 'chün-shih chu-i' " (Against "despotism"), HCN 5/6 (Dec. 15, 1918), p.551.

158. T'ao Meng-ho, "Wo-men ti cheng-chih sheng-huo" (Our political life), HCN 5/6 (Dec. 15, 1918), pp.562-563.

159. Kao I-han, "Chin-shih san ta cheng-chih ssu-hsiang chi pien-ch'ien" (The development of the three great political thoughts of recent times), HCN 4/1 (Jan. 15, 1918), p.1.

160. See for example: Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Po K'ang Yu-wei chih tsung-t'ung-li shu" (A refutation of K'ang Yu-wei's letter to the president), HCN 2/2 (Oct.1, 1916); Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 25, "The constitution and Confucianism"; Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 26, "The way of Confucius and modern life"; Yü Yü, 254,"The family and clan system as the basis of despotism; Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Po K'ang Yu-wei kung-ho p'ing-i". (A critique of K'ang Yu-wei's book, "A Discussion of Republic-anism"), HCN 4/3 (Mar. 15, 1918), pp.190-211.

161. "Correspondence" column, HCN 3/5 (July 1, 1917), p.6.

162. Hu Shih, "Ch'en Tu-hsiu yü wen-hsüeh ko-ming" (Ch'en Tu-hsiu and the literary revolution), in Ch'en Tuug-hsiao, Ch'en Tu-hsiu p'ing-lun (Critical discussions of Ch'en Tu-hsiu) (Peking, 1933), p.51.

163. Quoted by Ts'ao Chü-jen , 238, Fifty years in the literary world, p.99.

164. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.36.

165. Ibid, p.36.

166. Ibid, p.10.

Chapter 3. The Development of the Split between the Liberals and the Marxists.

1. D.C.Watt, Frank Spencer, Neville Brown, A History of the World in the Twentieth Century (London, 1967), p.255, p.303.
2. Lo Chia-lun, "I-nien-lai wo-men hsüeh-sheng yün-tung ti ch'eng-kung shih-pai ho chiang-lai ying ch'ü ti fang-chen" (The success and failure of our students' movement in the last year and the future direction that it should take), Hsin ch'ao, Vol.2 No.4 (May 1920), p.849.
3. Tso Shun-sheng, Chin san-shih nien chien-wen tsa-chi (A miscellaneous record of recollections of the last thirty years) (Hong Kong, 1952)p.5.
4. Teng Chung-hsia, Chung-kuo chih-kung yün-tung chien-shih (A short history of the Chinese labour movement) (1949), pp.11-12.
5. Sun Yat-sen, "Min-kuo chiu-nien yü hai-wai Kuo-min-tang t'ung-chih shu" (A letter to the overseas Kuomintang comrades in the ninth year of the Republic), dated Jan.29, 1920, in Hu Han-min, ed. Tsung-li ch'üan-chi (Complete works of the director-general) (Shanghai, 1930), Part 3, pp.343-348.
6. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 16, "Call to youth", HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915), p.2.
7. Tsi C. Wang, The Youth Movement in China (New York, 1928), p.169.
8. The mandate is reproduced in Tung-fang tsa-chih, Vol.16, No.6 (June 15, 1919), pp.223-224.
9. Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, 237, "My experiences in Peking University), Tung-fang tsa-chih, Vol.31 No.1 (Jan.1, 1934), p.11.
10. Ts'ai Hsiao-chou & Yang Ching-kung, ed. Wu-ssu (May Fourth), in Chin-tai shih tzu-liao (Materials on modern history), No.5 (Peking, 1955)p. 61.
11. Chia Chih 賈芝 , "Li Ta-chao t'ung-chih chan-tou ti i-sheng" 李大釗同志戰鬥的一生(Comrade Li Ta-chao's life of struggle), in Chung-kuo ch'ing-nien ch'u-pan-she 中國青年出版社 (Chinese Youth Publishing House), ed. Kuang-hui ti Wu-ssu 光輝的五四 (Glorious May Fourth) (Peking, 1959), p.38.
12. Li Ta-chao, "Tsai-lun wen-t'i yü chu-i" (Again on problems and isms), dated Aug.17, 1919, in Shih Tsün, 210, Collection of source materials on the history of modern Chinese thought, p.1260.
13. Li Ta-chao, "Huan-ying Tu-hsiu ch'u-yü" (Welcoming Ch'en Tu-hsiu out of prison), HCN 6/6 (Nov.1, 1919), p.589.
14. "Hsin-ch'ing-nien hsüan-yen" (Manifesto of New Youth), HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.1-4.
15. This account is basedon an interview with Hu Shih by Jerome Grieder in July 1960, Jerome Grieder, 278, p.184.
16. Li Long-mu, New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period, p.16.

Chap. 3 The Development of the Split.

17. "Manifesto of New Youth", 102, p.5.
18. Ibid, pp.5-6.
19. Ibid, p.6.
20. Ibid, p.7.
21. "Social Investigation" column, HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.96-108.
22. For a prospectus of the Corps, see "Pei-ching kung-tu hu-chu t'uan hsiao-hsi" (News of the Peking Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.185-188.
23. "Pei-ch'ing kung -tu hu-chu t'uan hsiao-hsi (News of the Peking Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps), HCN 7/3 (Feb.1, 1920), p.515.
24. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Kung-tu hu-chu t'uan ti shih-pai yüan-yin tsai na-li ?" (Where lie the causes of the failure of the Peking Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps?), HCN 7/5 (April 1, 1920), pp.16-17.
25. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Hsin wen-hua yün-tung shih shen-mo?" (What is the New Culture Movement?), HCN 7/5 (April 1, 1920), p.5.
26. Ibid, pp.5-6.
27. Li Ta-chao, "Pi-mi wai-chiao yü ch'iang-tao shih-chieh" (Secret diplomacy and a robbers' world), dated May 18, 1919, in Selected Works of Li Ta-chao, 184, p.212.
28. "Manifesto of New Youth", 102, p.3.
29. T'ao Meng-ho, "Ou-chan i-hou ti cheng-chih" (Politics after the European war), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.459-464.
30. T'ao Meng-ho, "Yu-Ou chih kan-hsiang" (Thoughts on a European visit), HCN 7/1 (Dec. 1, 1919), p.49.
31. The Chinese translation of the Karakhan Proposal can be found in HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-3.
32. Li Ta-chao, "Wo-ti Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i kuan" (My Marxist view), Part 1, HCN 6/5 (May 1, 1919), p.521.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid, p.533.
35. Ibid, pp. 534-535.
36. Ibid, pp.531-532.
37. Ibid, p.536.
38. Li Ta-chao, "Wo-ti Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i kuan" (My Marxist view), Part 2, HCN 6/6 (Nov.1, 1919), p.619.
39. Li Ta-chao, "My Marxist view", Part 1, p.537.
40. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.14.
41. Ku Chao-hsiung (Ku Meng-yü), "Ma-k'e-ssu hsüeh-shuo" (The theory of Marx), HCN 6/5 (May 1, 1919), pp.450-465.

Chap.3 The Development of the Split.

42. Wang Wen-chan (under the pen-name of Ling-shuang), "Ma-k'e-ssu hsüeh-shuo ti p'i-p'ing" (A critique of Marxist theory), HCN 6/5 (May 1919), pp.466-469.
43. Ch'en Ch'i-hsiu, "Ma-k'e-ssu ti wei-wu shih-kuan yü chen-ts'ao wen-t'i" (Marx's materialist conception of history and the chastity question), HCN 6/5 (May 1, 1919), pp.500-505.
44. Hu Shih, "An introduction to my own thought", op.cit., p.2.

45. "Manifesto of New Youth", 102, p.4.
46. "Tu-wei po-shih yen-chiang lu" 杜威博士演講錄 (A transcript of Dr. Dewey's speeches), HCN 7/1 (Dec. 1, 1919), pp.124-125.
47. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Shih-hsing min-chih ti chi-ch'u" (Foundation for the realisation of democracy), HCN 7/1 (Dec. 1, 1919), p.13.
48. Ibid, p.14.
49. "Tu-wei po-shih yen-chiang lu" 杜威博士演講錄 (A transcript of Dr. Dewey's speeches), HCN 7/3 (Feb.1, 1920), p.118.
50. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 38, "Foundation for the realisation of democracy", p.14.
51. "A transcipt of Dr. Dewey's speeches", op.cit., HCN 7/3, p.130.
52. Ibid, p.131.
53. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 38, "Foundation for the realisation of democracy", p.17.
54. John Dewey, "Mei-kuo chih min-chih ti fa-chan"美國之民治的發展 (The development of democracy in America", Mei-chou p'ing-lun (Weekly Critic), No.26 (June 15, 1919).
55. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 38, "Foundation for the realisation of democracy", p.16.
56. Hu Shih, "Wo-ti ch'i-lu" (My precipitous path), dated June 18, 1922, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.2 (Shanghai, 1931), Part 3, pp.96-97.
57. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propegated Marxism in the May Fourth period, p.15.
58. Hu Shih, "To yen-chiu hsieh wen-t'i, shao t'an hsieh chu-i" (More study of problems, less talk of isms), dated July 20, 1919, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un (Collected works of Hu Shih) Vol.1 (Shanghai, 1921), Part 2, pp.481-487.
59. Lan Kung-wu (under the pen-name of Chih-fei), "Wen-t'i yü chu-i" (Problems and isms), T'ai-p'ing-yang (Pacific Ocean), Vol.2 No.1 (May 5, 1920), pp.4-10.
60. Li Ta-chao, 178, "Again on problems and isms", p.1267.
61. Ibid, p.1256.
62. Ibid, p.1258.
63. Hu Shih, "San-lun wen-t'i yü chu-i" (Third discussion on problems and isms), dated Aug.24, 1919, in Collected Works of Hu Shih, 121,

Part 2, pp.511-524. Hu Shih, "Ssu-lun wen-t'i yü chu-i" (Fourth discussion on problems and isms), in ibid, pp.524-531.

64. Hu Shih, "Hsin ssu-ch'ao ti i-i" (The meaning of the new thought tide), HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), p.9.

65. Ibid, pp.11-12.

66. Li Ta-chao, "Yu ching-chi shang chiai-shih Chung-kuo chin-tai ssu-hsiang pien-tung ti yüan-yin" (An economic explanation of the causes of the changes in modern Chinese thought), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), p.47.

67. Ibid, p.48.

68. Ai Ssu-ch'i 艾思奇 in Shih-hsüeh chou-k'an 史學周刊 (Historiography Weekly), No.17, 1951, quoted in Chang Ching-lu, compiled, Chung-kuo hsien-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao (Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing), Chia-pien (Part 1) (Shanghai, 1954), p.13.

69. Chang Hsi-man, Li-shih hui-i (Recollections of history) (Shanghai, 1949), pp.136-148.

70. Ibid.

71. "Manifesto of New Youth", 102, pp.1-2.

72. Ibid, p.4.

73. Chou Tso-jen, "Hsin ts'un ti ching-shen" (The spirit of the New Village), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), p.129.

74. Ibid.

75. Mushakoji Saneatsu 武者小路實篤 (I-ko ch'ing-nien ti meng) 一個青年的夢 (A youth's dream), translated by Lu Hsün, HCN 7/2-5 (Jan.-Apr. 1920).

76. Mushakoji Saneatsu, "Yu Chih-na wei-chi ti yu-jen" 與支那未知的友人 (To Chinese friends unknown), translatedd by Chou Tso-jen, HCN 7/3 (Feb.1, 1920), pp.47-48. Also the replies of Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei, Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Chou Tso-jen in the same issue, pp.48-52.

77. "Hsin ts'un Pei-ching chih-pu ch'i-shih" 新村北京支部啓事 (Announcement from the Peking branch of the New Village), HCN 7/4 (Mar.1, 1920), inside-front-cover.

78. T'ao Meng-ho, "Ou Mei lao-tung wen-t'i" (The labour question in Europe and America), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.40-41.

79. Ibid, pp.42-44.

80. Ibid, pp.45-46.

81. Li Ta, "Ma-k'e-ssu p'ai she-hui chu-i" (The Marxist faction of socialism), in Hsin ch'ing-nien she pien-chi pu (Editorial Section of New Youth Society), ed. She-hui chu-i t'ao-lun chi (A col-

lection of essays on a discussion of socialism) (Canton, 1922), pp.171-191. Also Feng Tzu-yu, She-hui chu-i yü Chung-kuo (Socialism and China) (Hong Kong, 1920), pp.18-19.

82. Li Ta-chao, 178, "Again on problems and isms", pp.1261-1262.

83. Li Ta-chao, 180, "An economic explanation of the causes of the changes in modern Chinese thought", pp.50-51.

84. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ta Pan-nung ti D - shih" (In reply to Pan-nung's poem, D), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), p.56.

85. See Chapter 3, Section 3.

86. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Kuo-chi-p'ai yü shih-chieh ho-p'ing" (The extremists and world peace), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 7/1 (Dec. 1, 1919), pp.115-116.

87. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ma-erh-sai-ssu jen-k'ou lun yü Chung-kuo jen-k'ou wen-t'i (Malthus' theory of population and the question of population in China), HCN 7/4 (Mar.1, 1920), p.1.

88. Ibid.

89. Li Ta-chao, 178, "Again on problems and isms", pp.1259-1260.

90. Hu Han-min, Chung-kuo che-hsüeh shih chih wei-wu ti yen-chiu" (A materialist study of the history of Chinese philosophy), Chien-she (Construction), Vol.1, No.3 (Oct. 1919) and the following issues.

91. T'ai's translation appears in Construction, Vol.1 No.4 (Nov.1, 1919) and the following issues.

92. Feng Tzu-yu, 93, pp.18-19.

93. "Correspondence" column, HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), p.2.

94. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Lao-tung chieh ti chüeh-wu" (The awareness of the labouring world), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-2.

95. Ibid, p.2.

96. Ibid.

97. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, ed. "Shang-hai Hou-sheng sha-ch'ang Hu-nan nü-kung wen-t'i" (The question of the Hunanese female workers in the Shanghai Hou-sheng Textiles Factory), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-47.

98. Ibid, pp.43-44.

99. Ibid, pp.45-46.

100. Li Ta-chao, " 'Wu-i' yün-tung shih" (A history of the "May 1st" movement), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-13.

101. Ibid, pp.12-13.

102. Li Tse-chang, translated "O-lu-ssu su-wei-ai lien-pang kung-ho-huo lao-tung fa-tien" (The labour law of the U.S.S.R.), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1919), pp.1-19.

103. S.A.P. (of Russia), "Chih-kung t'ung-meng lun" (On trade unions), 職工同盟會

translated by C.S., HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-8.

104. "Tui-yü O-lo-ssu lao-nung cheng-fu t'ung -kao ti yü-lun (Public opinion on the proicamation of the Russian Government of Workers and Peasants), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-29.

105. Of the twenty-four articles in this issue, fourteen are on the labour movements and conditions in China.

106. HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), Daian photo-fascimile edition, p.978.

107. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "T'an cheng-chih" (On politics), HCN 8/1 (Sept. 1, 1920), p.1.

108. Ibid, p.3.

109. Ibid, p.4.

110. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Lan-tuo ti hsin-li" (The mentality of laziness), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/2 (Oct. 1, 1920), p.2.

111. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Chu-i yü nu-li" (Isms and endeavour), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/4 (Dec. 1, 1920), pp.2-3.

112. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Kuo-ch'ing chi-nien chia-chih" (The value in commemorating National Day), HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), p.1.

113. Ibid, p.2.

114. "Correspondence" column, HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), p.9.

115. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 46, "On politics", p.7.

116. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Tui-yü shih-chü ti wo-chien" (My view of the present situation), HCN 8/1 (Sept. 1, 1920), p.2.

117. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 49, "The value in commemorating National Day", p.3.

118. Hu Shih, Chiang Monlin and others, "Cheng tzu-yu hsüan-yen" (Manifesto for the struggle for freedom), reprinted in Tung-fang tsa-chih, Vol.17 No.16 (Aug.25, 1920), pp.133-134.

119. Quoted by Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 46, "On politics", p.2.

120. Ibid.

121. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.14.

122. Hu Han-min and others, "Ching-t'ien chih-tu yu-wu chih yen-chiu" (A study as to whether the well-field system existed, Chien-she (Construction), Vol.2 No.1 (Feb.1, 1920), pp.149-176. Also see Hu Han-min, 107, "A materialist study of the history of Chinese philosophy".

123. Sun Yat-sen, "Kai-tso Chung-kuo ti ti-i pu" (The firststep in the reformation of China), dated Jan.29, 1920, in Hu Han-min, ed. Complete works of the director-general, op.cit., Part 2,pp. 178-180.

124. Chang Tung-sun, "Hsien-tai yü chiang-lai" (The present and the future), Kai-tso (Reconstruction), Vol.3 No.4 (Dec.15, 1920).

Chap.3 The Development of the Split.

125. Bertrand Russell, The Problem of China (London, 1922), pp.242-245
126. Shen Yen-ping (Mao Tun), translated "Yu-O chih kan-hsiang" (Thoughts on a visit to Russia, by Bertrand Russell), HCN 8/2 (Oct. 1, 1920), pp.1-22.
127. Bertrand Russell, "Chung-kuo-jen tao tzu-yu chih-lu" 中國人到自由之路 (The Chinese road to freedom), in Chang Ching-lu, ed. Tu-wei Lo-su yen-chiang lu ho-k'an (A collection of the speeches by Dewey and Russell) (Shanghai, 1923), pp.15-23.
128. Yang Tuan-liu , "Ho Lo-su hsien-sheng ti t'an-hua (Talks with Mr. Russell), in Ch'en Tu-hsiu, ed. "Kuan-yü she-hui chu-i ti t'ao-lun" (A discussion concerning socialism), HCN 8/4 (Dec. 1, 1920), pp.15-16.
129. Ibid.
130. Bertrand Russell, The Problem of China, op.cit., p.250.
131. Chang Sung-nien, "Lo-su yü jen-k'ou wen-t'i" (Russell and the population question), HCN 7/4 (Mar. 1, 1920), pp.1-10. Also Kao I-han, "Lo-su ti she-hui che-hsüeh" (Russell's social philosophy), HCN 7/5 (Apr.1, 1920), pp.1-10.
132. See HCN 8/2 (Oct.1, 1920) and HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920).
133. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "San-lun Shang-hai she-hui" (A third discussion of the society in Shanghai), "Random Thoughts" column , HCN 8/3 (Nov. 1, 1920), p.2.
134. Shen Yen-ping (Mao Tun), translated "Lo-su lun So-wei-ai O-lo-ssu" (Russell on Soviet Russia, by Jacob Hartmann), HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), pp.1-8. Also Yüan Chen-ying, translated "P'i-p'ing Lo-su lun So-wei-ai O-lo-ssu" 批評羅素論蘇維埃俄羅斯 (A critique of Russell on Soviet Russia), HCN 8/4 (Dec.1, 1920), pp.1-4.
135. Quoted by Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism, p.115 and p.282 note 61.
136. Fang Lu 方魯 "Ch'ing-suan Ch'en Tu-hsiu" 清算陳獨秀 (Purge Ch'en Tu-hsiu), in Ch'en Tung-hsiao, 64 , Critical discussions of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, p.66.
137. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "She -hui ti kung-yeh chi yu-liang-hsin ti hsüeh-chieh" (Society's industry and learned men of conscience), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), p.1.
138. Chia Chih, "Comrade Li Ta-chao's life of struggle, op.cit., p.40.
139. "A Brief History of the Chinese Communist Party", in C.Martin Wilbur and Julie Lien-ying How, ed. Documents on Communism, Nationalism and Soviet Advisers in China, 1918-1927. (N.Y., 1956), p.42.
140. Ting Chou-ho, Yin Hsü-i, Chang Po-chao, Shih-yüeh Ko-ming tui

Chung-kuo ko-ming ti ying-hsiang (The influence of the October Revolution on the Chinese revolution) (Peking, 1957), p.148.

141. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, p.248.

142. Ho Kan-chih, Chung-kuo hsien-tai ko-ming shih chiang-i (Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China) (Peking, 1956), p.31. See also Chow Tse-tsung, ibid, p.250.

143. Li Lung-mu, "Wu-ssu shi-ch'i pao-k'an kung-tso ti kai-ko" 五四時期報刊工作改革 (The reform of the work in periodicals during the May Fourth period), in Chang Ching-lu, compiled, Chung-kuo hsien-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao (Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing), Ting-pien, shang (Part 4, vol.1) (Shanghai, 1959), p.31.

144. HCN 8/1 (Sept.1, 1920), back-cover.

145. Ibid, inside-back-cover.

146. HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), inside-back-cover.

147. Wang Chien-min, Chung-kuo kung-ch'an tang shih-kao (A draft history of the Chinese Communist Party), Vol.1 (Taipeh, 1965), p.28.

148. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.33.

149. Li Lung-mu, "Lun 'Wu-ssu' shih-ch'i pao-k'an kung-tso ti kai-ko" 論「五四」時期報刊工作的改革 (On the reform of the work in periodicals during the "May Fourth" period), in Shanghai Philosophical & Social Sciences Association), ed. 206, Collection of essays in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth Movement, p.88.

150. Wang Chien-min, 246 , A draft history of the Chinese Communist Party, Vol.1, p.31.

151. Li Lung-mu, "The reform of the work in periodicals during the May Fourth period", op.cit., p.31.

152. HCN 8/1 (Sept. 1, 1920), inside-front-cover.

153. Li Jui, 159, The early revolutionary activities of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, p.120.

154. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.33.

155. Ting Shou-ho et.al., 232, The influence of the October Revolution on the Chinese revolution, p.148.

156. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.37.

157. Edgar Snow, 315, Red Star Over China, p.181.

158. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, p.249. See also Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism, p.283 note 74.

Chap.3 The Development of the Split.

159. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.31. See also Chow Tse-tsung, 269, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, p.81.

160. Chang Ching-lu, 5, compiled, Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, Part 1, p.2.

161. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, p.250.

162. Benjamin I. Schwartz, Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao (Harvard U. Press, 1964), p.34.

163. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.33.

164. "A Brief History of the Chinese Communist Party", in C.Martin Wilbur and Julie Lien-ying How ed., Documents on Communism, Nationalism and Soviet Advisers in China, 1918-1927, op.cit., pp.49-50.

165. Fan Lu, "Purge Ch'en Tu-hsiu", op.cit., p.66.

166. Li Lung-mu, "On the reform of the work in periodicals during the May Fourth period", op.cit., pp.88-89.

167. Chow Tse-tsung, 269, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, p.80.

168. Ibid, p.87.

169. Li Lung-mu, "On the reform of the work of periodicals during the May Fourth period, op.cit., p.89.

170. "Social Investigation" column, HCN 8/1 (Sept.1, 1920), pp.1-18.

171. Hu Shih, "Chung-hsüeh kuo-wen ti chiao-shou" 中學國文的教授 (The teaching of Chinese literature in secondary schools), HCN 8/1 (Sept.1, 1920), pp.1-12.

172. Hu Shih, "Kuo-yü wen-fa ti yen-chiu fa" (Methods of research in the grammar of the national language), HCN 9/3 (July 1, 1921), pp.1-11.

173. Chang Chen-to, translated, "Wen-hsüeh yü hsien-tai ti O-lu-ssu" 文學與現代的俄羅斯(Literature and Russia today, by Maxim Gorky), HCN 8/2 (Oct.1, 1920), p.1.

174. "Studies of Soviet Russia" column, HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), pp.1-28.

175. Chang Tung-sun, in Ch'en Tu-hsiu, ed. "Kuan-yü she-hui chu-i ti t'ao-lun", op.cit., p.1.

176. Ibid, pp.7-8.

177. Ibid, p.8.

178. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, in ibid, pp.17-24.

179. "Kuan-yü Hsin ch'ing-nien wen-t'i ti cni-feng hsin" 關於新青年的幾封信 (Several letters concerning the question of New Youth), in Chang Ching-lu, 5, compiled, Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, p.7.

180. Ibid, p.8.
181. Ibid, pp.9-10.
182. Ibid.
183. Ibid.
184. Ibid, pp.10-11.
185. "Pien-chi shih tsa-chi" (Miscellaneous notes from the editorial office), HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), p.2.
186. "Several letters concerning the question of New Youth", op.cit., p.13.
187. Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism, p.220.
188. Hu Shih, Hu Shih wen-ts'un (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.3 (Shanghai, 1930).
189. Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, p.186 note 29.
190. HCN 7/2 (Jan. 1, 1920), inside-front-cover.
191. Hu Shih, 119, "The meaning of the new thought tide", p.5.
192. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.23.

Chapter 4. HCN As A Marxist Magazine, March 1921 - July 1927.

1. A contents of this number of Eastern Miscellany was included in an advertisement for the magazine, which was carried by HCN in its September 1921 issue.
2. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "T'ai-p'ing-yang hu-i yü T'ai-p'ing-yang jo-hsiao min-tsu" (The Pacific Conference and the helpless peoples of the Pacific), HCN 9/5 (Sept. 1, 1921), p.1.
3. Ibid, p.3.
4. Stuart Schram, Mao Tse-tung, (London, 1967), p.65.
5. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.41.
6. Ch'en Kung-po, The Communist Movement in China (Columbia U.Press, 1960), pp.106-109; cited in Stuart Schram, 307, p.66.
7. Teng Chung-hsia, 231, A short history of the Chinese labour movement, p.19.
8. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.47.
9. For a discussion of the debate at the Second Congress of the Comintern, see Hélène Carrère d'Encausse & Stuart Schram, Marxism & Asia (London, 1969), pp.26-31.
10. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern

China, p.43.

11. Ibid, p.44.

12. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.70.

13. HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), inside-front-cover.

14. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.28.

15. Ibid, p.29.

16. HCN Quarterly No.4 (Dec.20, 1924), page following contents.

17. The first figure is given in Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.55; also in John Wilson Lewis, Leadership in Communist China (Cornell U.Press, 1966), p.110. The second soruce also provides the second figure.

18. "Kung-ch'an tang" 共產黨 ("The Communist"), in An introduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth period, 90, Vol.2, p.11.

19. Li Ta, "Hu Shih fan-tung ssu-hsiang tsai cheng-chih shang ti piao-hsien" (The manifestations in politics of Hu Shih's reactionary thought), in Hu Shih ssu-hsiang p'i-p'ing (Peking, 1959), p.330.

20. Ting Shu-ch'i 丁樹奇, "Chung-kuo kung-ch'an tang ti ti-i-ko chi-kuan pao — Hsiang-tao" 中國共產黨的第一個機關報—嚮導 (Guide Weekly: the first official organ of the Chinese Communist Party), in Chang Ching-lu, 6, Part 4, vol.1, p.46.

21. C.Martin Wilbur, "The Influence of the Past: How the Early Years Helped to Shape the Future of the CCP", in John Wilson Lewis, ed. Party Leadership & Revolutionary Power in China (Cambridge U. Press, 1970), pp.43-45.

22. "Hsin ch'ing-nien chih hsin hsüan-yen" (The new manifesto of New Youth), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), p.1.

23. Ibid, p.2.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid, pp.3-5.

26. Ibid, p.6.

27. Li Ta, "Ma-k'e-ssu huan-yüan" (The revival of Marx), HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), pp.4-5.

28. Ibid, pp.5-6.

29. Ibid, p.7.

30. Ibid, p.3.

31. Li Ta's two translations from the Japanese are respectively in HCN 8/6 (April 1, 1921) and 9/3 (July 1, 1921). The third translation is in HCN 9/2 (June 1, 1921).

32. Li Chi, "She-hui chu-i yü Chung-kuo" (Socialism and China), HCN 8/6 (Apr.1, 1921), p.2.
33. Ibid, p.4.
34. Ibid, p.7.
35. Ibid, p.9.
36. Chou Fo-hai, "Tsung tzu-pen chu-i tsu-chih tao she-hui chu-i tsu-chih ti liang-t'iao tao-lu -- chin-fa yü ko-ming" (Evolution and revolution: two roads from capitalist organisation to socialist organisation), HCN 9/2 (June 1, 1921), pp.4-5.
37. Chou Fo-hai, "Random Thoughts", HCN 9/5 (Sept.1, 1921), p.1.
38. Li Ta-chao, "P'ing-min cheng-chih yü kung-jen cheng-chih" (The politics of the common people and the politics of the workers), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), p.54.
39. Kimura Kiyoshi, "Chin Doku-shü shippitsu katsudō nenpu" (A chronological list of Ch'en Tu-hsiu's writings), Gendai Chūgoku kenkyū sentaa ihō (Bulletin of the Modern China Study Centre), No.2 April 1962 (Tokyo), p.22.
40. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), p.5.
41. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "She-hui chu-i p'i-p'ing" (A critique of socialism), HCN 9/3 (July 1, 1921), pp.7-8.
42. Ibid, pp.8-9.
43. Ibid, pp.11-13.
44. Ibid, p.317.
45. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ma-k'e-ssu hsüeh-shuo" (The theory of Marx), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.1-9.
46. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Shih-chieh ko-ming yü Chung-kuo min-tsu chiai-fang" (The world revolution and the movement for liberation of the Chinese people), HCN Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1927), pp.1-3.
47. Ibid, pp.3-4.
48. Ibid, p.5.
49. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "Shih-chieh ti she-hui kai-tse yü Kung-ch'an kuo-chi" (The social transformation of the world and the Comintern), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), pp.24-25.
50. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "Hsien-tai lao-tzu chan-cheng yü ko-ming" (Today's labour-management and revolution), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), p.52.
51. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai (under the pen-name of Ch'ü Wei-ta), "Tzu min-chih chu-i tao she-hui chu-i" (From democracy to socialism), HCN Quarterly No.2 (Dec. 20, 1923), pp.101-102.
52. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that

propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period, p.31.

53. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "Lieh-ning chu-i yü Tu-lo-tz'u-chi chu-i" (Leninism and Trotskyism), HCN Irregular No.1 (April 22, 1925), pp.81-91.

54. Chou Fo-hai, "Shih-hsing she-hui chu-i yü fa-chen shi-yeh" (The implementation of socialism and the development of industry), HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), pp.1-2.

55. Ssu Ts'un-t'ung, "Ma-k'e-ssu ti kung-ch'an chu-i" (The communism of Marx), HCN 9/4 (Aug.1, 1921), p.9.

56. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, 81, "Today's labour-management war and revolution", p. 37.

57. Ibid, pp.37-38.

58. Lenin's "National Self-determination" is translated in HCN 8/3 (Nov. 1, 1920), and the other two translations are carried in HCN 9/2 (June 1, 1921).

59. Chang Ching-lu, "Lieh-ning chu-tso chung-i-pen nien-piao" 列寧著作中譯本年表 (A chronological list of Chinese translations of Lenin's works), in Chang Ching-lu, 7, compiled, Supplementary source materials for the history of Chinese publishing, pp.452-455.

60. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "Lieh-ning chu-i kai-lun" (A summary of Leninism), HCN Irregular No.1 (April 22, 1925), pp.29-27. Ch'ü's article is virtually a translation of parts of Chapters 1,2,3,4 and 8 of Stalin's The Foundation of Leninism; see Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.30.

61. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, 85, "A summary of Leninism", p.30.

62. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Lieh-ning chu-i yü Chung-kuo min-tsu yün-tung" (Leninism and the Chinese national movement), HCN Irregular No.1 (April 22, 1925), p.47.

63. Chang Ching-lu, 5, Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, Part 1, p.xiii.

64. For an advertisement of these books, see HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), inside-front-cover.

65. Chang Ching-lu, 5, Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, Part 1, p.xiv.

66. For advertisements of these books, see HCN Irregular No.1 (June 15, 1923), p.86, p.150, p.155.

67. Ibid, back-cover.

68. Kimura Kiyoshi, 152, "A chronological list of Ch'en Tu-hsiu's writings", p.28.

69. For an advertisement of this book, see HCN Irregular No.3 (Mar.25, 1926), page following contents.

Chap.4 HCN As A Marxist Magazine.

70. For a list of most of the books in the HCN book series, see HCN Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926), fourth page from inside-back-cover.

71. Chang Chiug-lu, "Ti-i-tz'u kuo-nei ko-ming chan-cheng shih-ch'i ch'u-pan-wu chien-mu, 1921-1927" 第一次國內革命戰爭時期出版物簡目, 1921-1927. (A short list of the books published during the First Revolutionary Civil War period, 1921-1927), in Chang Ching-lu, 5, compiled, Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, p.75.

72. These two articles are respectively in HCN 9/3 (July 1, 1921) and HCN 9/5 (Sept.1, 1921).

73. HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.117-129.

74. HCN Irregular No.2 (June 1, 1925), pp.14-32.

75. HCN Irregular No.3 (Mar. 25, 1926), pp.1-20.

76. "The new manifesto of New Youth", 103, p.4.

77. Lawrence Sullivan & Richard H. Solomon, "The Formation of Chinese Communist Ideology in the May Fourth Era: A Content Analysis of Hsin ch'ing-nien", in Chalmers Johnson, ed. Ideology & Politics in Contemporary China (Seattle, U. of Washington Press, 1973), p.126, pp.128-129, p.131.

78. P'eng Shu-chih, "Shui shih Chung-kuo kuo-min ko-ming chih ling-tao-che" (Who are the leaders of China's national revolution?), HCN Quarterly No.4 (Dec.20, 1924), p.4.

79. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", pp.31-32.

80. Ibid, p.32.

81. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Erh-shih-ch'i nien i-lai kuo-min yün-tüng chung so-te chiao-hsün" (The lesson of the Chinese national movement of the last twenty-seven years), HCN Quarterly No.4 (Dec.20, 1924), p.22.

82. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.32. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "Chung-kuo ko-ming chung-chih wu-chuang tou-cheng wen-t'i (The question of armed struggle in the Chinese revolution), HCN Irregular No.4 (May 25, 1926), pp.20-30.

83. "Ya-ch'ien nung-min hsieh-hui hsüan-yen" (Declaration of the Ya-ch'ien Peasants' Association), HCN 9/4 (Aug.1, 1921), pp.1-2.

84. Hsüan Lu, "Nung-min tzu-chüeh" (Self-determination of peasants), HCN 9/5 (Sept.1, 1921), pp.1-3.

85. Chou Fo-hai, "Random Thoughts"column, HCN 9/5 (Sept.1, 1921), p.2 .

86. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 59, "The lesson of the Chinese national movement

of the last twenty-seven years, p.22.

87. See the discussion in Benamin I. Schwartz, 313, Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao, pp.65-67.

88. Stuart R. Schram, 307, Mao Tse-tung, pp.81-82.

89. Benjamin I. Schwartz, 313, Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao, p.70; Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism, p.243.

90. Ch'u Ch'iu-pai, "Shih-chieh ti nung-min cheng-tang chi nung-min hsieh-hui" (The peasants' parties and associations in the world), HCN Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926), p.13.

91. "The new manifesto of New Youth", 103, p.5.

92. Ibid, p.6.

93. For articles on a general survey of the world's workers' movement, see HCN Quarterly No.3 (Aug.1, 1924) and Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926). For articles on the workers in France, India and Britain, see respectively HCN Quarterly No.2, Irregular Nos. 3+5. For articles on the national revolutions in Turkey and Morrocco, see respectivley HCN Quarterly No.4 (Dec.20, 1924) and Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926). For articles on the international economy, see Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926). For articles on British and American imperialism, see respectively Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926) and Irregular No.4 (May 25, 1926). For articles on the world's peasantry and the Western European peasantry, see respectively Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926) and Irregular No.2 (June 1, 1925).

94. Hélène Carrère d'Encausse & Stuart R. Schram, 274, Marxism and Asia , pp.53-54, pp.223-224.

95. Ibid, p.219, p.222.

96. See for example, Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period, pp.1-40.

97. Ibid, p.35.

Chapter 5. The End of the United Front of New Intellectuals: the Contention between Marxism & Other Ideas in the 1920s.

1. See the discussion in Chapter 3 Section 10.

2. Tso Shun-sheng, 241, A miscellaneous record of recollections of the last thirty years, Chapter 2.

3. Kimura Kiyoshi, 152, A chronological list of Ch'en Tu-hsiu's writings, pp.17-28.

4. "Weh-hsüeh yen-chiu hui hsüan-yen" (Manifesto of the Society

for Literary Studies), HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), p.1.

5. Kuo Mo-jo, "Wen-hsüeh ko-ming chih-hui-ku" 文學革命之回顧 (A retrospective view of the literary revolution), in Chang Ching-lu, 5, compiled, Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, Part 1, p.133.

6. For an account of the Thread-of-Talk Society and the Crescent Moon Society, see Amitendranath Tagore, Literary Debates in Modern China, 1918-1937 (Tokyo, 1967), Chapter 2.

7. Kuo Mo-jo "A retrospective view of the literary revolution", op.cit., pp.133-134.

8. Hu Shih, Ting Wen-chiang ti chuan-chi (A biography of Ting Wen-chiang) (Taipeh, 1960), pp.35-36. For Hu's original idea for a new magazine, see Chapter 4 Section 12.

9. Hu Shih, 123, "My precipitous path", p.99.

10. "Wo-men ti cheng-chih chu-chang" (Our political porposals), dated May 14, 1922, in Collected works of Hu Shih, 129, Part 3, p.99.

11. Ibid, pp.28-33.

12. Letter from Ch'eng Chen-chi 程振基, in "Kuan - yü 'Wo-men ti cheng-chih chu-chang' ti t'ac-lun" 關於「我們的政治主張」的討論 (The discussion concerning "Our political proposals"), in ibid, p.66.

13. See the account in Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, pp.241-242.

14. Conrad Brabdt, Benjamin I. Schwartz & John K. Fairbank, ed. A Documentary History of Chinese Communism (New York, 1967), p.60.

15. Hu Shih, "Lien-sheng tzu-chih yü chün-fa ko-chü" (A federation of self-governing provinces and warlord separatism), dated Sept. 10, 1922, in Collected works of Hu Shih, 129, Part 3, pp.114-115.

16. Ch'en Tu-shiu, "Lien-sheng tzu-chih yü Chung-kuo cheng-hsiang" (A federation of self-governing provinces and the political situation in China). Hsaing -tou chou-pao (Guide Weekly), No.1 (Sept.13, 1922), pp.2-4.

17. For an account of the federalist movement in the early 1920s, see Jean Chesneaux, "The Federalist Movement in China, 1920-3", in Jack Gray, ed., 277, Modern China's Search for a Political Form, pp.96-137.

18. Conrad Brandt et.al., 263, A Documentary History of Chinese Communism, p.64.

19. Hu Shih, "Kuo-chi ti Chung-kuo" (An international China), dated Oct.1, 1922, in Collected works of Hu Shih, 129, Part 3, pp.120a-i.

20. Hu Shih, "Yü I-han teng ssu-wei ti hsin" (Letter to Kao I-han and three others), dated Oct. 1923, in Collected works of Hu Shih, 129, Part 3, p.142.

21. See, for example, I-chün 以群, "Ts'ung wen-hsüeh kai-liang tao chen-ch'ien p'an-pien" 從文學改良到陣前叛變 (From literary reform to mutiny on the front-line), in Collection of essays in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth Movement, 206, pp.165-193.

22. See, for example, Lo Sun 羅蓀, "Lun Wu-ssu shih-ch' hsin wen-hsüeh yün-tung ti liang-t'iao tao-lu tou-cheng" 論五四時期新文學運動的兩條道路鬥爭 (On the struggle of the two lines in the new literature movement in the May Fourth period), in ibid, pp.63-65.

23. Ch'en Yüan-hui, Hsien-tai tzu-ch'an chiai-chi ti shih-yung che-hsüeh (The pragmatist philosophy of the contemporary bourgeoisie) (Peking, 1973), p.2, p.12.

24. For an account of the Chinese Communist attack on Hu Shih, see Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, Appendix C, pp.358-368.

25. Hung Huan-ch'un, "Wu-ssu yün-tung shih-ch'i Mo-k'e-ssu chu-i tsai Chung-kuo ti chuan-po chi ch'i-tui tzu-ch'an chiai-chi wei-hsin chu-i ssu-hsiang ti tou-cheng" 五四運動時期馬克斯主義在中國的傳播及其對資產階級唯心主義思想的鬥爭(The propagation of Marxism in China during the period of the May Fourth movement and its struggle with the idealist thoughts of the bourgeoisie), in A collection of essays on the May Fourth movement, 138, p.66.

26. "The new manifesto of New Youth", 103, HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), p.5.

27. Li Ta, "Tao-lun she-hui chu-i ping chih Liang Jen-kung" (A discussion of socialism and a critique of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao), HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), p.1.

28. Ibid, pp.5-6.

29. Ibid, pp.8 -10.

30. Ibid, pp.10-11.

31. Ibid, pp.13-15.

32. Hsin K'ai, "Tsai lun kung-ch'an chu-i yü chi-erh-t'e she-hui chu-i (Another discussion of communism and guild socialism), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.37-38.

33. Ssu Ts'un-t'ung, "Tu Hsin K'ai hsien-sheng ti 'Kung-ch'an chu-i yü chi-erh-t'e she-hui-chu-i'" (On reading Mr.Hsin K'ai's "Communism and guild socialism), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.29-30.

34. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "P'ing Lo-su chih she-hui chu-i kuan" (A critique

of Russell's socialist view), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), p.148.

35. Li Kuang-i, "Kuan-yü Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ti 'she-hui chu-i lun-chan' " (On the "socialism debate" in the May Fourth period), in A collection of essays on the May Fourth movement, 138, p.93.

36. See the two articles by Martin Bernal: "Triumph of Anarchism Over Marxism, 1906-7", in Mary C. Wright, ed. 323, China in Revolution: The First Phase, 1900-1913, pp.97-142; "Chinese Socialism before 1913", in Jack Gray, ed. 277 , Modern China's Search for a Political Form, pp.66-95.

37. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Random Thoughts", HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), p.6.

38. Ou Sheng-pai & Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Tao-lun wu cheng-fu chu-i" (A discussion of anarchism), HCN 9/4 (Aug.1, 1921), pp.9-10.

39. Ibid, pp.26-27.

40. See Ch'en's note appended to the publication of the correspondence between himself and Ou Sheng-pai, ibid, p.32.

41. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", pp.28-29.

42. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng-kuan hsü" (Preface to "Science and view of life"), HCN Quarterly No.2 (Dec.20, 1923), p.36.

43. Hu Shih, "K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng-kuan hsü" (Preface to "Science and view of life"), in Selected works of Hu Shih, 127, pp.72-73.

44. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ta Shih-chih" 答適之 (In reply to Hu Shih), in K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng-kuan (Science and view of life), Vol.1 (Shanghai, 1923), p.40.

45. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, "Shih-yen chu-i yü ko-ming che-hsüeh" (Pragmatism and revolutionary philosophy), HCN Quarterly No.3 (Aug.1, 1924), p.11.

46. Chiang Kuang-ch'ih, "Ping fei hsien-hua" (Not being idle talk), HCN Irregular No.4 (May 25, 1926), pp.97-98.

47. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", pp.33-34.

48. Ibid, pp.34-35.

49. Hung Huan-ch'un, 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.161.

50. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Chi Hsi-liu ti hsin" 給西流的信 (Letter to Hsi-liu), dated September 1940, in Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Ch'en Tu-hsiu tzu-ch'uan (The autobiography of Ch'en Tu-hsiu) (Hong Kong, 1969), pp.70-72.

51. Ibid, pp.74-76.

Chapter 6. Perspectives On the May Fourth Movement.

1. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, p.6.
2. Martin Bernal, "Chinese Socialism before 1913", in Jack Gray, ed. 277, Modern China's Search for a Political Form, p.66.
3. Ibid, p.67.
4. Hung Huan-ch'un, 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.67.
5. Li Shu-shih, "Wu-ssu yün-tung" 五四運動 (The May Fourth movement), in A collection of essays on the May Fourth movement, 138, p.55.
6. Hung Huan-ch'un , 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.55.
7. For a list of modern Chinese socialist terms of Japanese origin, see Li Yu-ming, The Introdcution of Socialism into China (Columbia U. Press, 1971), Chapter 4.
8. C.Martin Wilbur, 321, "The Influence of the Past: How the Early Years Helped to Shape the Future of the CCP", p.47.
9. Ibid, pp.47-48.
10. Edgar Snow, 315, Red Star Over China, p.512.
11. Li Kuang-i, "On the 'socialism debate' in the May Fourth period" , op.cit., p.88.
12. Benjamin I. Schwartz, 313, Chinese Communism & the Rise of Mao, p.25.
13. Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism, p.263.
14. Li Ta-chao, 178, "Again on problems and isms", p.1258.
15. See Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism, pp.262-264; also Stuart R. Schram, 308, The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung, pp.31-34.
16. See for example, John Israel, "Continuities & Discontinuities in the Ideology of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution", in Chalmers Johnson ed., 288, Ideology & Politics in Contemporary China, pp.3-46; also Stuart Schram, "From the 'Great Union of the Popular Masses' to the 'Great Alliance' ", China Quarterly, No.49 (Jan.-Mar. 1972), pp.88-105.
17. Mao Tse-tung, "On New Democracy", Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vol.2 (Peking, 1965), pp.347-348. See also Lo Chu-feng 羅竹風, "Ts'ung Wu-ssu yün-tung k'an chih-shih fen-tzu ti tao-lu " 從五四運動看知識分子的道路(A look at the road for the intellectuals in the perspective of the May Fourth movement), in Collection of essays in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth movement, 206, p.14.
18. Ibid, p.12. See also Mao Tse-tung, "The May Fourth Movement", in

Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, 303, Vol.2, p.237.

19. Hung Huan-ch'un, 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.179..

20. Ibid, p.1.

21. Lo Chu-feng, "A look at the road for the intellectuals in the perspective of the May Fourth movement", op.cit., p.19.

22. Hung Huan-ch'un, 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.66.

23. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 59, "The lesson of the Chinese national movement of the last twenty-seven years, p.15.

24. Mao Tse-tung, "On New Democracy", op.cit., pp.373-374.

25. Hua Kang, 139, A history of the May Fourth movement, p.160.

26. Lo Chu-feng, "A look at the road for the intellectuals in the perspective of the May Fourth movement", op.cit., p.20.

27. Liu Lung-ch'ao 劉弄潮 , "Ling-tao Wu-ssu yün-tung ti chu-chaing — Li Ta-chao t'ung-chih" 領導五四運動的主將—李大釗同志(Comrade Li Ta-chao: the commander who led May Fourth Movement), in A collection of essays on the May Fourth movement, 138, p.55.

28. Li Kuang-i, "Wu-ssu shih-ch'i Li Ta-chao t'ung-chih tsai ssu-hsiang chan-hsien ti tou-cheng" 五四時期李大釗同志在思想戰線上的鬥爭(The struggle of Comrade Li Ta-chao on the ideological front during the May Fourth period), in ibid, p.79.

29. Tu Hsüeh-wen, "Kuan-yü Ch'en Tu-hsiu ti chieh-lun" (A conclusion concerning Ch'en Tu-hsiu) Ta-kung pao (Impartial Daily) (Hong Kong, July 9, 1971).

30. Ho Kan-chih, 97, Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China, p.41.

31. Lo Sun, "On the sturggle of the two lines in the new literature movement of the 'May Fourth' period", op.cit., p.48.

32. Hung Huan-ch'un, 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.182.

33. Yin Fa-lu 陰法魯 , "Wu-ssu ai-kuo yün-tung shih-ch'i kung-jen chin-hsing cheng-chih tou-cheng ti chi-shu tuan-p'ien" 五四愛國運動時期工人進行政治鬥爭的記述斷片 (Miscellaneous records of the political struggle carried out by workers during the period of the May Fourth patriotic movement), in A collection of essays on the May Fourth movement, 138, p.34. See also Mao Tse-tung, "On New Democracy", op.cit., p.374.

34. "Wu-ssu yün-tung wu-shih nien" 五四運動五十年 (Fifty years of the May Fourth movement), joint editorial in People's Daily, Red Flag and Liberation Army's Daily on May 3rd, 1969, reprinted in a booklet form by the San-lien Bookshop (Hong Kong, 1969), p.7.

35. Lo Chu-feng, "A look at the road for the intellectuals in the perspectives of the May Fourth Movement", op.cit., p.16.
36. Hua Kang, 132, A history of the May Fourth movement, p.94.
37. Lo Chu-feng, "A look at the road for the intellectuals in the perspective of the May Fourth movement", op.cit., p.15.
38. Ibid, p.18; see also Hung Huan-ch'un, 140, The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period, p.183.
39. Hu Shih, 119, "The meaning of the new thought tide", p.6.
40. Hu Shih, 114, "Ibsenism", pp.489-507.
41. See for example, Yü-sheng Lin, "Radical Iconoclasm in the May Fourth Period & the Future of Chinese Liberalism", in Benjamin I. Schwartz, ed. Reflections On the May Fourth Movement, (Harvard U. Press, 1972), pp.23-24.
42. Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, p.287.
43. Hu Shih, "Wo-men tsou na-i-t'iao lu?" 我們走那一條路? (Which road shall we follow?), first published in Dec.10, 1929, translated and reprinted in Hu Shih & Lin Yutang, China's Own Critics (Peking, 1931), p.12.
44. Hu Shih, The Chinese Renaissance (U. of Chicago Press, 1934), pp.ix-x.
45. Robert W. Clapton & Tsuin-chen Ou, John Dewey, Lectures in China, 1919-1920, (U. of Hawaii, 1973), p.10.
46. Hu Shih, 284, "Which Road Shall We Follow?", p.20.
47. Hu Shih, "Ai-kuo yün-tung yü ch'iu-hsüeh" (The patriotic movement and education), in Collected works of Hu Shih, 131, Part 9, p.1250.
48. Hu Shih, 123, "My precipitous path", pp.100-101.
49. Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, p.208.
50. Joseph R. Levenson, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao & the Mind of Modern China (U. of California Press, 1967), pp.217-218.
51. Jerome Grieder, "The Question of 'Politics' in the May Fourth Era", in Benjamin I. Schwartz, ed. 314, Reflections On the May Fourth Movement, pp.96-97.
52. See respectively Benjamin I. Schwartz, 313, Chinese Communism & the Rise of Mao, p.7; Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism, p.35; Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, p.43; Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, 278, p.75.
53. Chou Wei-huang & Hung Ch'ing-hsiang, "T'an-t'an Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ti chung-yao ch'i-k'an" (On the important periodicals of the May Fourth period), Wen-i pao (Journal of Literature & Art), No.8, April 26, 1959 (Peking), pp.38-39.

Chap.6 Perspectives On the May Fourth Movement.

54. Fu-tan ta-hsüeh Chung-wen hsi erh-nien chi Hsien-tai wen-hsüeh tsu 復旦大學中文系二年級現代文學組 (The Modern Literature Group of the second-year students in the Chinese Language Faculty of the Futan University), " 'Wu-ssu' hsin wen-hsüeh yün-tung ti ling-tao ch'üan wen-t'i" 五四新文學運動的領導權問題 (The question of leadership in the new literature movement of "May Fourth"), in Collection of articles in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth movement, 206, p.31.
55. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period, p.35.
56. Ibid, pp.36-37.
57. Lawrence Sullivan & Richard H. Solomon, "The Formation of Chinese Communist Ideology in the May Fourth Era: A Content Analysis of Hsin ch'ing-nien", in Chalmers Johnson, ed. 288, Ideology & Politics in Contemporary China, pp.119-120.
58. For a description of the procedures in Sullivan and Solomon's contents analysis, see ibid, pp.123-127.
59. Ibdi, p.158.
60. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 59, "The lesson of the Chinese national movement of the last twenty-seven years", p.15.
61. Joseph R. Levenson, 295, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao & the Mind of Modern China, p.121.
62. Mao Tse-tung, "The Chinese Revolution & the Chinese Communist Party", Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, 303, Vol.2, p.307.
63. See for example, Hu Shih, 113, "On a constructive literary revolution", pp.289-334.
64. Hu Shih, 283, The Chinese Renaissance, p.44.
65. Chiang Kuang-ch'ih, 68, "Not being idle talk", pp.98-99.
66. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 59, "The lesson of the Chinese national movement of the last twenty-seven years", p.19.
67. Mao Tse-tung, "On New Democracy", op.cit., p.374.
68. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, pp.358-359.

Appendix A. Biographical Notes On the Personnel Associated with HCN.

1. Wang Shen-jan, 248, Critical biographies of twenty modern Chinese, pp.249-276; Ch'en Tu-hsiu, 63, The autobiography of Ch'en Tu-hsiu, pp.1-41.
2. Hu Shih, Ssu-shih tzu-shu (Autobiography written at forty), enlarged edition (Taipeh, 1954). See also Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, Chapters 1 & 2.

3. For an account of Hu Shih's life after 1927, see Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, Chapters 7,8 and 9.
4. Maurice Meisner, 304, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism, pp.1-28.
5. Chow Tse-tsung, 268, The May Fourth Movement, p.53; also Howard L. Boorman, Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, Vol.1 (Columbia U. Press, 1967), p.367.
6. Fan Yin-nan, Tsng-tai Chung-kuo ming-jen lu (Biographiesof famous contemporary Chinese) (Shanghai, 1931), p.120.
7. Jerome Grieder, 278, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance, pp.361-362.
8. Fan Yin-nan, 92, Biographies of famous contemporary Chinese, p.219.
9. Chia I-chün, ed. Chung-hua-min-kuo ming-jen ch'uan (Biographies of famous people in the Republic of China) Vol.2 (Peking, 1932), pp.21-47. See also E.S.Lubot, Ts'ai- Yüan-p'ei, from Confucian Scholar to the Chancellor of Peking University, 1868-1923: the Evolution of a Patient Reformer (University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1972).
10. Howard L.Boorman ed., 262, Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, Vol.2, pp.394-395.
11. Ts'ao Chü-jen, "Lu Hsün nien-pu" (A chronological biography of Lu Hsün), Wen-i shih-chi (Literary Century), No.1, June 1957 (Hong Kong), pp.26-27. See also Huang Sung-k'ang, Lu Hsün & the New Culture of Modern China (Amsterdam, 1957).
12. Howard L. Boorman, 262, Biographical Dictationary of Republican China, Vol.1, pp.424-426. See also David E. Pollard, A Chinese Look at Literature, the Literary Values of Chou Tso-jen in Relation to the Tradition (London, 1973).
13. Chow Tse-tsung, 269, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, p.48, p.72.
14. T.A.Hsia, "Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai's Autobiographical Writings: the Making & Destruction of a 'Tender-Hearted Communist' ", China Quarterly, No.5 (Jan.-Mar. 1966), p.186.
15. Edgar Snow, 315, Red Star Over China, p.530.
16. Howard L. Boorman, ed., 262, Biographical Dictationary of Republican China, Vol.1, pp.475-479. See also Ting Ching-t'ang 丁景唐 , " 'Wu-ssu' ch'u-ch'i ti Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai" 五四初期的瞿秋白 (The Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai of the early May Fourth period), in Collection of essays in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth movement, 206, pp.109-130; and Ssu-ma Lu, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai ch'uan (A biography of Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai) (Hong Kong, 1962).
17. Union Research Institute, Who's Who in Communist China (Hong

Appendix A. Biographical Notes.

Kong, 1966), pp.85-86.

18. Howard L. Boorman, 262, Biographical Dictationary of Republican China, Vol.2, p.238. See alos Edgar Snow, 315, Red Star Over China, p.546.

19. Howard L. Boorman, ed., 262, Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, Vol.1, pp.405-406.

20. Fujita Masanori, Gendai Chūgoku jinbutsu-hyō (A list of modern Chinese with brief biographical notes) (Tokyo, 1969), p.87. See also Fan Yin-nan, 92, Biographies of famous contemporary Chinese, p.238.

21. Li Lung-mu, 161, "New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period", p.27.

22. Donald W.Klein & Anne B. Clark, Biographical Dictionary of Chinese Communism, 1921-1965 (Harvard U. Press, 1971), Vol.2, pp.759-760.

Appendix B. Important Periodicals of the May Fourth Period.

1. Chow Tse-tsung, 269, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, p.1.

2. Chiang Monlin estimated that between May and end of 1919, about 350 weekly magazines were founded. (Chiang Monlin, "The Student Movement", in E.C.Lobenstine & A.L. Warnshuis, ed. The China Year Book, 1919 (Shanghai, 1920), p.51.) Hu Shih gave a similar number of 400 periodicals that were founded in 1919. (Hu Shih, 126, "Chinese literature in the last fifty years", p.206.)

3. Li Lung-mu, "I-ko 'Wu-ssu' shih-ch'i ti cheng-chih k'an-wu --- Mei-chou p'ing-lun" 一個"五四"時期的政治刊物---每周評論(Weekly Critic: A political periodical of the May Fourth period), in Chang Ching-lu, compiled, 6. Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing, Part 4, vol.1, p.40.

4. Hu Shih, 132, "Ch'en Tu-hsiu and the literary revolution", p.51.

5. Li Lung-mu, "Weekly Critic: A political periodical of the May Fourth period", op.cit. p.43.

6. Fu Ssu-nien, "Hsin ch'ao chih hui-ku yü ch'ien-chan" (Retrospect and outlook on New Tide), Hsin ch'ao (New Tide), Vol.2, No.1 (Oct. 1919), pp.119-205.

7. Fu Ssu-nien, "Hsin ch'ao fa-k'an chih-chü shu" (Aims for the establishment of New Tide magazine), Hsin ch'ao, Vol.1, No.1 (Jan.1, 1919), pp.1-3.

8. "Hsin chiao-yü kung-chin she ch'i" (Announcement from the Society for the Promotion of the New Education), HCN 6/2 (Feb.15, 1919), p.243.

9. Tso Shun-sheng, 241, Miscellaneous records of the last thirty

Appendix B. May Fourth Periodicals.

years, Chap.2, p.5.

10. Fu Ssu-nien, "Retrospect and outlook on New Tide", op.cit., p. 204.

11. Mei-chou p'ing-lun, No.36 (1919), p.4; and also Lo Chia-lun, 191, "The success and failure of our students' movement in the last year and the future direction that it should take", p.849. For a discussion of Mao's essay, see Stuart R. Schram, 308, The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung, pp.34-5, p.236, pp.458-460.

12. "Social Investigation" column, HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), p.103.

Appendix C. Periodicals Published by the Early Communist Groups and the Chinese Communist Party, 1920-1926.

1. Li Lung-mu, "On the reform of the work of periodicals during the May Fourth period,op.cit., p.88.

2. Ibid, p.87.

3. Yin Fa-lu, "The Peiyang warlords' suppression of progressive periodicals", op.cit., pp.97-98.

4. Chang Ching-lu, "A chronological list of Chinese translations of Lenin's works", op.cit., pp.453-455.

5. The two figures are given in advertisements for Guide Weekly in respectively HCN Quarterly No.4 (Dec.20, 1924),p.113 and HCN Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926), back-cover.

6. See the advertisemnet for Vanguard, HCN Quarterly No.3 (Aug.1, 1924), page following contents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is not exhaustive, but contains the more important sources and works. Works by the same author are listed chronologically by dates of publication.

CHINESE SOURCES.

1. Ai Ssu-ch'i 艾思奇, "Yu-ti fang shih" chi ch'i-t'a" 靶的放矢及其他("Shooting arrows at a target" and other essays) (Shanghai, 1951).
2. Chang Ching-lu 張靜廬, ed. Tu-wei Lo-su yen-chiang lu ho-k'an 杜威羅素演講錄合刊 (A collection of the speeches by Dewey and Russell) (Shanghai, 1923).
3. ——— compiled, Chung-kuo chin-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao 中國近代出版史料 (Source materials for the history of modern Chinese publishing), Ch'u-pien 初編 (Part 1) (Shanghai, 1953).
4. ——— compiled, Chung-kuo chin-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao 中國近代出版史料 (Source materials for the history of modern Chinese publishing), Erh-pien 二編 (Part 2) (Shanghai, 1954).
5. ——— compiled, Chung-kuo hsien-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao 中國現代出版史料 (Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing), Chia-pien 甲編 (Part 1) (Shanghai, 1954).
6. ——— compiled, Chung-kuo hsien-tai ch'u-pan shih-liao 中國現代出版史料 (Source materials for the history of contemporary Chinese publishing), Ting-pien 丁編 (Part 4) (Shanghai, 1959).
7. ——— compiled, Chung-kuo ch'u-pan shih-liao pu-pien 中國出版史料補編 (Supplementary source materials for the history of Chinese publishing) (Peking, 1957).
8. Chang Hsi-man 張西曼, Li-shih hui-i 歷史回憶 (Recollections of history) (Shanghai, 1949).
9. Chang Sung-nien 張崧年, "Lo-su yü jen-k'ou wen-t'i" 羅素與人口問題 (Russell and the population question), HCH 7/4 (March 1, 1920), pp.1-10.

10. Chang Sung-nien, "She-hui" 社會 (Society), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 9/3 (July 1, 1921), pp.1-2.
11. ——— "Kung-chan chu-i chih chieh-shuo" 共產主義之界說 (The scope of Communism), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.85-86.
12. Chang Tung-sun 張東蓀 "Hsien-tai yü chiang-lai" 現代與將來 (The present and the future), Kai-tso 改造 (Reconstruction), Vol.3, No.4 (Dec. 15, 1920)
13. Chao Chia-pi 趙家璧, ed. Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi 中國新文學大系 (A corpus of Chinese new literature), 10 volumes (Shanghai, 1935).
14. Ch'en Ch'i-hsiu 陳啓修, "Ma-k'e-ssu ti wei-wu shih-kuan yü chen-ts'ao wen-t'i" 馬克思的唯物史觀與貞操問題 (Marx's materialist conception of history and the chastity question), HCN 6/5 (May , 1919), pp.500-505.
15. Ch'en Tu-hsiu 陳獨秀, "Ai-kuo-hsin yü tzu-chüeh-hsin" 愛國心與自覺心 (Patriotism and self-consciousness), Chia-yin tsa-chih 甲寅雜誌 (Tiger Magazine), Vol.1, No.4 (1915), pp.1-6.
16. ——— "Ching-kao ch'ing-nien" 敬告青年 (Call to youth), HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915), pp.1-6.
17. ——— "Fa-lan-hsi-jen yü chin-tai wen-ming" 法蘭西人與近代文明 (The French and contemporary civilisation), HCN 1/1 (Sept. 15, 1915), pp.1-4.
18. ——— "Chin-jih chih chiao-yü fang-chen" 今日之教育方針 (Principles of education today), HCN 1/2 (Oct. 15, 1915), pp.1-6.
19. ——— "Hsien-tai Ou-chou wen-i shih t'an" 現代歐洲文藝史譚 (A discussion of the history of contemporary European literature), HCN 1/3-4 (Nov.15 & Dec., 1915)
20. ——— "Tung Hsi min-tsu ken-pen ssu-hsiang chih ch'a-i" 東西文族根本思想之差異 (Differences between the basic ideas of the Eastern and Western peoples), HCN 1/4 (Dec.15, 1915), pp.1-4.
21. ——— "I-chiu-i-liu nien" 一九一六年 (The year 1916), HCN 1/5 (Jan. 1916), pp.1-4.
22. ——— "Wu-jen chih tsui-hou chüeh-wu" 吾人之最後覺悟 (Our final awakening), HCN 1/6 (Feb.15, 1916), pp.1-4.
23. ——— "Tang-tai erh-ta k'o-hsüeh-chia chih ssu-hsiang" 當代二大科學家之思想 (The thoughts of two great contemporary scientists), HCN 2/1 & 2/3 (Sept.1 & Nov.1, 1916), pp.1-6, pp.1-8.
24. ——— "Po K'ang Yu-wei chih tsung-t'ung-li shu" 駁康有為致總統理書 (A refutation of K'ang Yu-wei's letter to the president), HCN 2/2 (Oct.1, 1916), pp.1-4.

25. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Hsien-fa yü K'ung-chiao" 憲法與孔教 (The constitution and Confucianism), HCN 2/3 (Nov.1, 1916), pp.1-5.

26. ——— "K'ung-tzu chih tao yü hsien-tai sheng-huo" 孔子之道與現代生活 (The way of Confucius & contemporary life), HCN 2/4 (Dec.1, 1916), pp.1-7.

27. ——— "Wen-hsüeh ko-ming lun" 文學革命論 (On literary revolution), HCN 2/6 (Feb.1, 1917), pp.1-4.

28. ——— "O-lo-ssu ko-ming yü wo-kuo-min chih chüeh-wu" 俄羅斯革命與我國民覺悟 (The Russian Revolution and the awakening of our countrymen), HCN 3/2 (Apr.1, 1917), pp.1-3.

29. ——— "Chiu ssu-hsiang yü kuo-ti wen-t'i" 舊思想與國體問題 (The old thought and the question of state-form), HCN 3/3 (May 1, 1917), pp.1-3.

30. ——— "Chin-tai Hsi-yang chiao-yü" 近代西洋教育 (Contemporary Western education), HCN 3/5 (July 1, 1917), pp.1-4.

31. ——— "Jen-sheng chen-i" 人生眞義 (The true meaning of life), HCN 4/2 (Feb.15, 1918), pp.90-93.

32. ——— "Po K'ang Yu-wei kung-ho p'ing-i" 駁康有爲共和平議 (A critique of K'ang Yu-wei's book, "A Discussion of Republicanism"), HCN 4/3 (Mar.15, 1918), pp.190-211.

33. ——— "Yu-kuei lun chih-yi" 有鬼論質疑 (Doubts on the existence of ghosts), HCN 4/5 (May 15, 1918), pp.408-409.

34. ——— "Chin-jih Chung-kuo chih cheng-chih wen-t'i" 今日中國之政治問題 (The political question in China today), HCN 5/1 (July 15, 1918), pp.1-4.

35. ——— "Ou-hsiang p'o-huai lun" 偶像破壞論 (On iconoclasm), HCN 5/2 (Aug.15, 1918), pp.89-91.

36. ——— "K'e-lin-te pei" 克林德碑 (The Von Ketteler Monument), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.449-458.

37. ——— "Pen-chih tsui-an ta-pien shu" 本誌罪案答辯書 (In answer to the charges against the magazine), HCN 6/1 (Jan.15, 1919), pp.10-11.

38. ——— "Shih-hsing min-chih ti chi-ch'u" 實行民治的基礎 (Foundation for the realisation of democracy), HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.13-21.

39. ——— "Kuo-chi-p'ai yü shih-chieh ho-p'ing" 過激派與世界和平 (The extremists and world peace), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.115-116.

40. ——— "Ta Pen-nung ti D ——— shih" 答半農的D———詩 (In reply to Pen-nung's poem ——— D), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.55-57.

41. ——— "Ma-erh-sai-ssu jen-k'ou lun yü Chung-kuo jen-k'ou wen-t'i" 馬爾塞斯人口論與中國人口問題(Malthus's theory of population and the qeustion of population in China), HCN 7/4 (Mar.1, 1920), pp.1-10.

42. ——— "Hsin wen-hua yün-tung shih shen-mo?" 新文化運動是什麼? (What is the New Culture Movement?), HCN 7/5 (April 1,1920), pp.1-6.

43. ——— "Kung-tu hu-chu t'uan ti shih-pai yüan-yin tsai na-li?" 工讀互助團底失敗原因在那裏(Where lie the causes of the failure of the Peking Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps?), HCN 7/5 (April 1, 1920), pp.16-17.

44. ——— "Lao-tung chieh ti chüeh-wu" 勞動者的覺悟 (The awareness of the labouring world), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920),pp.1-2.

45. ——— ed. "Shang-hai Hou-sheng sha-ch'ang Hu-nan nü-kung wen-t'i" 上海厚生紗廠湖南女工問題(The question of the Hunanese female workers in the Shanghai Hou-sheng Textiles Factory), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-47.

46. ——— "T'an cheng-chih" 談政治 (On politics), HCN 8/1 (Sept.1, 1920), pp.1-9.

47. ——— "Tui-yü shih-chü ti wo-chien" 對於時局的我見(My view of the present situation), HCN 8/1 (Sept.1, 1920), pp.1-2.

48. ——— "Lan-tuo ti hsin-li" 懶惰的心理 (The mentality of laziness), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/2 (Oct.1, 1920), pp.2-3.

49. ——— "Kuo-ch'ing chi-nien chia-chih" 國慶紀念價值 (The value in commemorating National Day), HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), pp.1-4.

50. ——— "She-hui ti kung-yeh chi yu-liang-hsin ti hsüeh-chieh" 社會的工業及有良心的學者(Society's industry and learned men with conscience), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), p.1.

51. ——— "San-lun Shang-hai she-hui" 三論上海社會 (A third discussion of the society in Shanghai), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), p.2.

52. ——— "Chu-i yü nu-li" 主義與努力 (Isms and endeavour), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/4 (Dec.1, 1920), pp.2-3.

53. ——— "She-hui chu-i p'i-p'ing" 社會主義批評 (A critique of socialism), HCN 9/3 (July 1, 1921), pp.1-13.

54. ——— "T'ai-p'ing-yang hui-i yü T'ai-p'ing-yang jo-hsiao min-tsu" 太平洋會議與太平洋弱小民族(The Pacific Conference and the helpless peoples of the Pacific), HCN 9/5 (Sept.1, 1921), pp.1-4.

55. Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Ma-k'e-ssu hsüeh-shuo" 馬克思學說 (The theory of Marx), HCN 9/6 (July1, 1922), pp.1-9.

56. ——— "Lien-sheng tzu-chih yü Chung-kuo cheng-hsiang" 聯省自治與中國政象 (A federation of self-governing provinces and the political situation in China), Hsiang-tao chou-pao 嚮導週報(Guide Weekly), No.1 (Sept.13, 1922), pp.2-4.

57. ——— Tu-hsiu wen-ts'un 獨秀文存 (Collected works of Ch'en Tu-hsiu), 4 volumes (Shanghai, 1922).

58. ——— "K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng-kuan hsü", 科學與人生觀序(Preface to "Science & view of life") HCN Quarterly No.2 (Dec.20, 1923), pp.31-36.

59. ——— "Erh-shih-ch'i nien i-lai kuo-min yün-tung chung so-te chiao-hsün" 二十七年以來國民運動中所得教訓(The lesson of the Chinese national movement of the last twenty-seven years), HCN Quarterly No,4 (Dec.20, 1924), pp.15-22.

60. ——— "Lieh-ning chu-i yü Chung-kuo min-tsu yün-tung" 列寧主義與中國民族運動 (Leninism and the Chinese national movement), HCN Irregular No.1 (April 22, 1925), pp.47-52.

61. ——— "Shih-chieh ko-ming yü Chung-kuo min-tsu chiai-fang yün-tung" 世界革命與中國民族解放運動 (The world revolution and the movement for liberation of the Chinese people), HCN Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1927), pp.1-5.

62. ——— Ch'en Tu-hsiu ti tsui-hou tui-yü min-chu cheng-chih ti chien-chiai 陳獨秀的最後對於民主政治的見解(Ch'en Tu-hsiu's last views on democratic politics) (Taipeh, 1959).

63. ——— Ch'en Tu-hsiu tzu-ch'uan 陳獨秀自傳 (The autobiography of Ch'en Tu-hsiu) (Hong Kong, 1969).

64. Ch'en Tung-hsiao 陳東曉 , ed. Ch'en Tu-hsiu p'ing-lun 陳獨秀評論 (Critical discussions of Ch'en Tu-hsiu) (Peking, 1933).

65. Ch'en Wang-tao 陳望道 , "Ts'ung cheng-chih ti yün-tung hsiang she-hui ti yün-tung" 從政治的運動向社會的運動 (From a political movement to a social movement), "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 8/6 (April 1, 1921), pp.3-4.

66. Ch'en Yüan-hui 陳元暉 , Hsien-tai tzu-ch'an chiai-chi ti shih-yung che-hsüeh 現代資產階級的實用哲學 (The pragmatist philosophy of the contemporary bourgeoisie) (Peking, 1973).

67. Chia I-chün 賈逸君 , ed. Chung-hua-min-kuo ming-jen ch'uan 中華民國名人傳 (Biographies of famous people in the Republic of China) 2 volumes (Peking, 1932).

68. Chiang Kuang-ch'ih 蔣光赤 , "Ping fei hsien-hua" 並非閒話 (Not being idle talk), HCN Irregular No.4 (May 25, 1926), pp.97-104.

69. Chiai-fang yü kai-tso 解放與改造 ("The Emancipation & Reconstruction"), periodical, vols. 3 & 4 (Peking, 1920-1921).

70. Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung 錢玄同 , letters to the "Correspondence" column of HCN, 2/6 - 3/6 (Feb.1, 1917 - Aug. 1, 1917).

71. ------ (under the pen-name of Wang Ching-hsüan 王敬軒), "Wen-hsüeh ko-ming chih fan-hsiang" 文學革命之反響 (A reaction to the literary revolution), "Correspondence" column, HCN 4/3 (Mar.15, 1918), pp.265-268.

72. Chien-she 建設 (Construction), periodical, vols.1 & 2 (Shanghai, 1919-1920).

73. Chou Fo-hai 周佛海 "Shih-hsing she-hui chu-i yü fa-chan shih-yeh" 實行社會主義與發展實業 (The implementation of socialism and the development of industry), HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), pp.1-12.

74. ------ "Ts'ung tzu-pen chu-i tsu-chih tao she-hui chu-i tsu-chih ti liang-t'iao tao-lu --- chin-fa yü ko-ming 從資本主義組織到社會主義組織的兩條道路——進化與革命 (Evolution and revolution: two roads from capitalist organisation to socialist organisation), HCN 9/2 (June 1, 1921), pp.1-9.

75. Chou Tso-jen 周作人 , "Jih-pen ti Hsin-ts'un" 日本的新村 (The New Village of Japan), HCN 6/3 (Mar.15, 1919), pp.266-277.

76. ------ "Hsin-ts'un ti ching-shen" 新村的精神 (The spirit of the New Village), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.129-134.

77. ------ (under the pen-name of Chung-mi 仲密), "Ssu-hsiang ko-ming" 思想革命 (Revolution in thought), HCN 6/4 (April 15, 1919), pp.396-397.

78. Chou Wei-huang 周維煌 & Hung Ch'ing-hsiang 洪清祥 "T'an-t'an Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ti chung-yao ch'i-k'an" 談談五四時期的重要期刊 (On the important periodicals of the May Fourth period), Wen-i pao 文藝報 (Journal of Literature & Art), No.8, April 26, 1959 (Peking), pp.38-43.

79. Chow Tse-tsung 周策縱 "Wu-ssu wu-shih nien" 五四五十年 (Fifty years after May Fourth), Ming-pao yüeh-k'an 明報月刊 (Ming-pao Monthly), No.41, May 1969 (Hong Kong), pp.2-9.

80. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai 瞿秋白 , "Shih-chieh ti she-hui kai-tso yü Kung-cha'an kuo-chi" 世界的社會改造與共產國際 (The social transformation of the world and the Comintern), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), pp.12-36.

81. ——— "Hsien-tai lao-tzu chan-cheng yü ko-ming" 現代勞資戰爭與革命 (Today's labour-management war and revolution), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), pp.37-56.

82. ———"P'ing Lo-su chih she-hui chu-i kuan" 評羅素之社會主義觀 (A critique of Russell's socialist view), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), pp.147-149.

83. ——— (under the pen-name of Ch'ü Wei-ta 屈維它), "Tzu min-chih chu-i tao she-hui chu-i" 自民治主義到社會主義 (From democracy to socialism), HCN Quarterly No.2 (Dec.20, 1923), pp.79-102.

84. ——— "Shih-yen chu-i yü ko-ming che-hsüeh" 實驗主義與革命哲學 (Pragmatism and revolutionary philosophy), HCN Quarterly No.3 (Aug.1, 1924), pp.10-16.

85. ——— "Lieh-ning chu-i kai-lun" 列寧主義概論 (A summary of Leninism), HCN Irregular No.1 (April 22, 1925), pp.29-47.

86. ——— "Lieh-ning chu-i yü Tu-lo-tz'u-chi chu-i" 列寧主義與杜洛茨基主義 (Leninism and Trotskyism), HCN Irregular No.1 (April 22, 1925), pp.81-91.

87. ——— "Chung-kuo ko-ming chung-chih wu-chuang tou-cheng wen-t'i" 中國革命中之武裝鬪爭問題 (The question of armed struggle in the Chinese revolution), HCN Irregular No.4 (May 25, 1926), pp.20-30.

88. ——— "Shih-chieh ti nung-min cheng-tang chi nung-min hsieh-hui" 世界的農民政黨及農民協會 (The peasants' parties and associations in the world), HCN Irregular No.5 (July 25, 1926), pp.1-13.

89. ——— Lun Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh ko-ming 論中國文學革命 (On the Chinese literary revolution) (Hong Kong, 1947)

90. Chung-kung Chung-yang Ma-En-Lieh-Ssu chu-tso pien-i chü 中共中央馬恩列斯著作編譯局 (Bureau for the Compilation & Translation of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin & Stalin, Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party), ed. Wu-ssu shi-ch'i ch'i-k'an chieh-shao 五四時期期刊介紹 (An introduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth period), 3 volumes (Peking, 1958 & 1959).

91. Chung-kuo k'o-hsüeh yüan Li-shih yen-chiu so ti-san so 中國科學院歷史研究所第三所 (The Third Section of the Institute of Historical Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences), ed. Wu-ssu ai-kuo yün-tung tzu-liao 五四愛國運動資料 (Source materials on the May Fourth patriotic movement) (Peking, 1959).

92. Fan Yin-nan 樊蔭南 Tang-tai Chung-kuo ming-jen lu 當代中國名人錄 (Biographies of famous contemporary Chinese) (Shanghai, 1931).

93. Feng Tzu-yu 馮自由 She-hui chu-i yü Chung-kuo 社會主義與中國 (Socialism and China) (Hong Kong, 1920).

94. Fujita Masanori 藤田正典, Gendai Chūgoku jinbutsu-hyō 現代中國人物表 (A list of modern Chinese with brief biographical notes) (Tokyo, 1969).

95. Fu Ssu-nien 傅斯年 "Hsin ch'ao fa-k'an chih-chü shu" 新潮發刊旨趣書 (Aims for the establishment of New Tide magazine), Hsin ch'ao 新潮 (New Tide), Vol.1 No.1 (Jan.1, 1919), pp.1-3.

96. ——— "Hsin ch'ao chih hui-ku yü ch'ien-chan" 新潮之回顧與前瞻 (Retrospect and outlook on New Tide), Hsin ch'ao, Vol.2, No.1 (Oct. 1919), pp.119-205.

97. Ho Kan-chih 何幹之 Chung-kuo hsien-tai ko-ming shih chiang-i 中國現代革命史講義 (Lectures on the revolutionary history of modern China) (Peking, 1956).

98. Hsiang-tao chou-pao 嚮導週報 (Guide Weekly), periodical, 1923-1927 (Shanghai, Canton). A five-volume photo-fascimile edition was published in 1963 by the Daian Company of Tokyo.

99. Hsin ch'ao 新潮 (New Tide), periodical, Vols. 1-3, 1919-1922 (Peking).

100. "Hsin chiao-yü kung-chin she ch'i" 新教育共進社啓 (An announcement from the Society for the Promotion of New Education), HCN 6/2 (Feb.15, 1919), pp.265-244.

101. Hsin ch'ing-nien 新青年 (New Youth), 1915-1926 (Shanghai, Peking, Canton). A fourteen-volume photo-fascimile edition was published in 1963 by the Daian Company of Tokyo.

102. "Hsin ch'ing-nien hsüan-yen" 新青年宣言 (Manifesto of New Youth), HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.1-4.

103. "Hsin ch'ing-nien chih hsin hsüan-yen" 新青年之新宣言 (The new manifesto of New Youth), HCN Quarterly No.1 (June 15, 1923), pp.1-6.

104. Hsin ch'ing-nien she pien-chi pu 新青年社編輯部 (Editorial Section of New Youth Society), ed. She-hui chu-i t'ao-lun chi 社會主義討論集 (A collection of essays on a discussion of socialism) (Canton, 1922).

105. Hsin K'ai 新凱 , "Tsai lun kung-ch'an chu-i yü chi-erh-t'e she-hui chu-i" 再論共產主義與基爾特社會主義 (Another discussion of communism and guild socialism), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.37-50.

106. Hsüan Lu 玄廬 , "Nung-min tzu-chüeh" 農民自決 (Self-determination of peasants), HCN 9/5 (Sept.1, 1921), pp.1-4.

107. Hu Han-min 胡漢民 , "Chung-kuo che-hsüeh shih chih wei-wu ti yen-chiu" 中國哲學史之唯物的研究 (A materialist study of the history of Chinese philosophy), Chien-she 建設 (Construction), Vol.1, No.3 (Oct. 1919) and the following issues.

108. ——— and others,"Ching-t'ien chih-tu yu-wu chih yen-chiu" 井田制度有無之研究 (A study as to whether the well-field system existed), Chien-she, Vol.2, No.1 (Feb.1. 1920), pp.149-176.

109. Hu Hua 胡華 , ed. Chung-kuo hsin min-chu chu-i ko-ming shih tzu-liao 中國新民主主義革命史資料 (Source materials on the history of the new democratic revolution in China) (Shanghai, 1951).

110. Hu Shih 胡適 , "Ts'ang-hui shih cha-chi" 藏暉室劄記 (Notes from the Ts'ang-hui Room), first extract appeared in HCN 2/4 (Dec.1, 1916), and the next ten extracts appeared irregularly, with the last one appearing in 5/3 (Sept.15, 1918).

111. ——— "Wen-hsüeh kai-liang ch'u-i" 文學改良芻議 (Tentative proposals for literary reform), HCN, 2/5 (Jan.1, 1917), pp.1-11.

112. ——— "Kuei kuo tsa-kan" 歸國雜感 (Miscellaneous thoughts on returning to China), HCN 1/1 (Jan.15, 1918), pp.20-27.

113. ——— "Chien-she ti wen-hsüeh ko-ming lun" 建設的文學革命論 (On a constructive literary revolution), HCN 4/4 (April 15, 1918), pp.289-306.

114. ——— I-pu-sheng chu-i" 易卜生主義 (Ibsenism), HCN 4/6 (June 15, 1918), pp.489-507.

115. ——— introduction to the "What Nonsense" column (Shen-mo hua 什麼話), HCN 5/4 (October 15, 1918), p.435.

116. ——— "To yen-chiu hsieh wen-t'i, shao t'an hsieh chu-i" 多研究些問題,少談些主義 (More study of problems, less talk of isms), dated July 20, 1919, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un 胡適文存 (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.1 (Shanghai, 1921), Part 2, pp.481-487.

117. Hu Shih, "San lun wen-t'i yü chu-i" 三論問題與主義 (A third discussion on problems and isms), dated Aug.24, 1919, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Vol.1, Part 2, pp.511-524.

118. ——— "Ssu lun wen-t'i yü chu-i" 四論問題與主義 (A fourth discussion on problems and isms), dated Aug.31, 1919, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Vol.1, Part 2, pp.524-531.

119. ——— "Hsin ssu-ch'ao ti i-i" 新思潮的意義 (The meaning of the new thought tide), HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.5-11.

120. ———, Chaing Monlin and others, "Cheng tzu-yu hsüan-yen" 爭自由宣言 (Manifesto for the struggle of freedom), Tung-fang tsa-chih 東方雜誌 (Eastern Miscellany), Vol.17, No.16 (Aug.25, 1920), pp.133-134.

121. ——— Hu Shih wen-ts'un 胡適文存 (Collected works of Hu Shih) Vol.1 (Shanghai, 1921).

122. ——— "Kuo-yü wen-fa ti yen-chiu fa" 國語文法的研究法 (Methods of research in the grammar of the national language), HCN 3/3 (July 1, 1921), p.1-11.

123. ——— "Wo-ti ch'i-lu" 我的岐路 (My precipitous path), dated June 18, 1922, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un 胡適文存 (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.2 (Shanghai, 1931), Part 3, pp.91-108.

124. ——— "Lien-sheng tzu-chih yü chün-fa ko-chü 聯省自治與軍閥割據 (A federation of self-governing provinces and warlord separatism), dated Sept.10, 1922, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Vol.2, Part 3, pp.109-119.

125. ——— "Kuo-chi ti Chung-kuo" 國際的中國 (An international China), dated Oct.1, 1922, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Vol.2, Part 3, pp.128a-i.

126. ——— "Yü I-han teng ssu-wei ti hsin" 與一涵等四位的信 (Letter to Kao I-han and three others), dated Oct.1923, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Vol.2, part 3, pp.141-144.

127. ——— "K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng kuan hsü" 科學與人生觀序 (Preface to "Science and view of life), dated Nov.29, 1923, in Hu Shih wen-hsüan 胡適文選 (Selected works of Hu Shih) (Taipeh, 1968), pp.53-73.

128. ——— "Wu-shih nien-lai Chung-kuo chih wen-hsüeh" 五十年來中國之文學 (Chinese literature in the last fifty years), dated 1923, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Vol.2, Part 2, pp.91-213.

129. ——— Hu Shih wen-ts'un 胡適文存 (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.2 (Shanghai, 1924).

130. ——— "Ai-kuo yün-tung yü chiu-hsüeh" 愛國運動與求學 (The patriotic movement and education), dated Sept.5, 1925, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un 胡適文存 (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.3 (Shanghai, 1930), Part 9, pp.1145-1154.

131. ——— Hu Shih wen-ts'un 胡適文存 (Collected works of Hu Shih), Vol.3 (Shanghai, 1930).

132. ——— "Ch'en Tu-hsiu yü wen-hsüeh ko-ming" 陳獨秀與文學革命 (Ch'en Tu-hsiu and the literary revolution), in Ch'en Tung-hsiao, Ch'en Tu-hsiu p'ing-lun, pp.51-57.

133. ——— Ssu-shih tzu-shu 四十自述 (Autobiography written at forty), enlarged edition (Taipeh, 1954).

134. ——— Ting Wen-chiang ti ch'uan-chi 丁文江的傳記 (A biography of Ting Wen-chiang) (Taipeh, 1960).

135. ——— Hu Shih wen-hsüan 胡適文選 (Taipeh, 1968).

136. Hu Shih ssu-hsiang p'i-p'an 胡適思想批判 (A critique of Hu Shih's thought), 8 volumes (Peking, 1955-56).

137. Hu Shih ssu-hsiang p'i-p'an 胡適思想批判 (A critique of Hu Shih's thought) (Peking, 1959).

138. Hua-chung kung-hsüeh-yüan Ma-k'e-ssu Lieh-ning chu-i tzu-liao shih 華中工學院馬克思列寧主義資料室 (Reference Section on Marxism-Leninism, Central China Technical College), ed. Wu-ssu yün-tung wen-chi 五四運動文輯 (A collection of essays on the May Fourth Movement) (Wuhan, 1957).

139. Hua Kang 華岡 , Wu-ssu yün-tung shih 五四運動史 (A history of the May Fourth Movement) (Shanghai, 1952).

140. Hung Huan-ch'un 洪煥椿 Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ti Chung-kuo ko-ming yün-tung 五四時期中國革命運動 (The Chinese revolutionary movement in the May Fourth period) (Peking, 1956).

141. Jung Meng-yüan 榮孟源 "Hsin-hai ko-ming ch'ien Chung-kuo shu-k'an shang tui Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i ti chieh-shao" 辛亥革命前中國書刊上對馬克思主義的介紹 (The introduction of Marxism in Chinese publications before the 1911 Revolution), Hsin chien-she 新建設 (New Construction), No.3, 1953 (Peking), pp.5-12.

142. Kao I-han 高一涵 , "Kung-ho kuo-chia yü ch'ing-nien chih tzu-chüeh" 共和國家與青年之自覺 (The republic and the self-awareness of youth), HCN 1/1 (Sept.15, 1915), pp.1-38.

143. ———"Chin-shih kuo-chia kuan-nien yü ku hsiang-i chi kai-lüeh 近世國家觀念與古相異之概畧 (An overview of the similarities and differences between the ancient and modern view of the state), HCN 1/2 (Oct.15, 1915), pp.1-10.

144. Kao I-han, "Min-yüeh pang-pen" 民約與邦本 (The social contract and the state), HCN 1/3 (Nov.15, 1915), pp.1-6.

145. ——— "Tai-hsüeh Yin-kuo yen-lun tzu-yu chih ch'üan-li lun" 戴雪英國言論自由之權利論 (A.V.Dicey's discussion of the right to freedom of speech in Britain), HCN 1/6 (Feb.15, 1916), pp.1-3.

146. ——— "Lo-li chu-i yü jen-sheng" 樂利主義與人生 (Utilitarianism and life), HCN 2/1 (Sept.1, 1916), pp.1-6.

147. ——— "Chin-shih san ta cheng-chih ssu-hsiang chi pien-ch'ien" 近世三大政治思想之變遷(The development of the three great political thoughts of recent times), HCN 4/1 (Jan.15, 1918), pp.1-4.

148. ——— "Fei 'chün-shih chu-i' " 非君師主義 (Against "despotism"), HCN 5/6 (Dec.15, 1918), pp.549-554.

149. ——— "Ssu-pin-sai-erh ti cheng-chih che-hsüeh" 斯賓塞爾的政治哲學 (Spencer's political philosophy), HCN 6/3 (Mar.15, 1919), pp.254-265.

150. ——— "Tui-yü chih-an ching-ch'a t'iao-li ti p'i-p'ing" 對於治安警察條例的批評 (A criticism of the security and police regulations), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.15-23.

151. ——— "Lo-su ti she-hui che-hsüeh" 羅素的社會哲學 (The social philosophy of Russell), HCN 7/5 (April 1, 1920), pp.1-10.

152. Kimura Kiyoshi 木村靖子 "Chin Doku-shū chippitsu katsudō nenpu" 陳獨秀執筆活動年譜 (A chronological list of Ch'en Tu-hsiu's writings), Gendai Chūgoku kenkyū sentaa ihō 近代中国研究センター彙報 (Bulletin of the Modern China Study Centre), No.2, April 1962 (Tokyo), pp.17-28.

153. K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng kuan 科學與人生觀 (Science and view of life), 2 volumes (Shanghai, 1923).

154. Ko Kung-chen 戈公振 Chung-kuo pao-hsüeh shih 中國報學史 (A history of Chinese journalism), 2nd edition (Shanghai, 1927).

155. Ku Chao-hsiung 顧兆熊 (Ku Meng-yü 顧孟餘), "Ma-k'e-ssu hsüeh-shuo" 馬克思學說 (The theory of Marx), HCN 6/5 (May 1, 1919), pp.450-465.

156. Kuo Chan-po 郭湛波, Chin wu-shih nien Chung-kuo ssu-hsiang shih 近五十年中國思想史 (A history of Chinese thought in the last fifty years), 2nd edition (Peking, 1936).

157. Lan Kung-wu 藍公武 (under the pen-name of Chih-fei 知非), "Wen-t'i yü chu-i" 問題與主義 (Problems and isms), T'ai-p'ing-yang 太平洋 (Pacific Ocean), Vol.2 No.1

(May 5, 1920), pp.4-10.

158. Li Chi 李季 , "She-hui chu-i yü Chung-kuo" 社會主義與中國 (Socialism and China), HCN 8/6 (April 1, 1921), pp.1-9.

159. Li Jui 李銳 Mao Tse-tung t'ung-chih ti ch'u-ch'i ko-ming huo-tung 毛澤東同志的早期革命活動(The early revolutionary activities of Comrade Mao Tse-tung) (Peking, 1957).

160. Li Lung-mu 李龍牧 , "Li Ta-chao t'ung-chih ho Wu-ssu shih-ch'i Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i ssu-hsiang ti hsüan-ch'uan" 李大釗同志和五四時期馬克思主義思想的宣傳(Comrade Li Ta-chao and the propagation of Marxist thought during the May Fourth period) in Li-shih yen-chiu 歷史研究 (Historical Research), No.5, 1957 (Peking), pp.1-18.

161. ——— "Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ch'uan-po Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i ti ch'ung yao k'an-wu: Hsin ch'ing-nien" 五四時期傳播馬克思主義的重要刊物:新青年 (New Youth: An important periodical that propagated Marxism in the May Fourth period), in Chung-kung Chung-yang Ma-En-Lieh-Ssu chu-tso pien-i chü 中共中央馬恩列斯著作編譯局 (Bureau for the Compilation & Translation of the Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin & Stalin, Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party), ed. Wu-ssu ch'i-k'an chieh-shao 五四期刊介紹 (An interduction to the periodicals of the May Fourth period), Vol.1 (Peking, 1958), pp.1-40.

162. Li Shu 黎澍 Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i yü Chung-kuo ko-ming 馬克思主義與中國革命 (Marxism and the Chinese revolution) (Peking, 1963).

163. Li Ta 李達 , "Ma-k'e-ssu huan-yüan" 馬克思還原 (The revival of Marx), HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), pp.1-8.

164. ——— "Tao-lun she-hui chu-i ping chih Liang Jen-kung" 討論社會主義並質梁任公 (A discussion of socialism and a critique of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao), HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), pp.1-15.

165. ——— "Ma-k'e-ssu p'ai she-hui chu-i" 馬克思派社會主義 (The Marxist faction of socialism), in Hsin ch'ing-nien she pien-chi pu, ed. She-hui chu-i t'ao-lun chi, pp.171-191.

166. ——— "Hu Shih fan-tung ssu-hsiang tsai cheng-chih shang ti piao-hsien" 胡適反動思想在政治上的表現(The manifestations in politics of Hu Shih's reactionary thought), in Hu Shih ssu-hsiang p'i-p'an (Peking, 1959), pp.327-341.

167. Li Ta-chao 李大釗, "Ch'ing-ch'un" 青春 (Spring), HCN 2/1 (Sept.1, 1916), pp.1-12.

168. ——— "O-kuo ta ko-ming chih ying-hsiang" 俄國大革命之影響 (The influence of the great Russian Revolution), dated March 1917, in Li Ta-chao hsüan-chi, pp.81-82.

169. ——— "Ch'ing-nien yü lao-jen" 青年與老人 (Young and old people), HCN 3/2 (April 1, 1917), pp.1-4.

170. ——— "Chin" 今 (The present), HCN, 4/4 (April 15, 1918), pp.307-310.

171. ——— "Hsin-ti ! chiu-ti!" 新的!舊的! (The new! the old!), HCN 4/5 (May 15, 1918), pp.446-449.

172. ——— "Fa O ko-ming chih pi-chiao kuan" 法俄革命之比較觀 (A comparative view of the French and Russian revolutions), dated July 1918, in Shih Tsün, ed. Chung-kuo chin-tai ssu-hsiang shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao chien-pien, pp.1201-1204.

173. ——— "Shu-min ti sheng-li" 庶民的勝利 (Victory of the common people), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.436-438.

174. ——— "Bolshevism ti sheng-li" Bolshevism的勝利 (Victory of Bolshevism), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.442-448.

175. ——— "Chan-hou chih fu-jen wen-t'i" 戰後的婦人問題 (The post-war women question), HCN 6/2 (Feb.15, 1919), pp.141-147.

176. ——— "Wo-ti Ma-k'e-ssu chu-i kuan" 我的馬克思主義觀 (My Marxist view), HCN 6/5-6 (May & Nov.1, 1919), pp.521-537, pp.612-624.

177. ——— "Pi-mi wai-chiao yü ch'iang-tao shih-chieh" 秘密外交與強盜世界 (Secret diplomacy and a robbers' world), dated May 18, 1919, in Li Ta-chao hsüan-chi, pp.212-214.

178. ——— "Tsai lun wen-t'i yü chu-i" 再論問題與主義 (Again on problems and isms), dated Aug.17, 1919, in Shih Tsün, Chung-kuo chin-tai ssu-hsiang shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao chien-pien, pp.1256-1262.

179. ——— "Huan-ying Tu-hsiu ch'u-yü" 歡迎獨秀出獄 (Welcoming Ch'en Tu-hsiu out of prison), HCN 6/6 (Nov.1, 1919), pp.533-539.

180. ——— "Yu ching-chi shang chiai-shih Chung-kuo chin-tai ssu-hsiang pien-tung ti yüan-yin" 由經濟上解釋中國近代思想變動的原因 (An economic explanation of the causes of the changes in modern Chinese thought), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.47-53.

181. ——— " 'Wu-i' yün-tung shih" 「五一」運動史 (A History of the "May 1st" movement), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-13.

182. ——— "P'ing-min cheng-chih yü kung-jen cheng-chih" 平民政治與工人政治 (The politics of the common people and the politics of the workers), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.51-55.

183. ——— Shou-ch'ang wen-chi 守常文集 (Collected writings of Shou-ch'ang) (Shanghai, 1950).

184. ——— Li Ta-chao hsüan-chi 李大釗選集 (Selected writings of Li Ta-chao) (Peking, 1959).

185. Li Tse-chang 李澤彰 , translated "O-lu-ssu su-wei-ai lien-pang kung-ho-kuo lao-tung fa-tien" 俄羅斯蘇維埃聯邦共和國勞動法典 (The labour law of the U.S.S.R.), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1919), pp.1-19.

186. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao 梁啓超 , "Ou-yu hsin ying-lu" 歐遊心影錄 (A record of impressions on a European journey), dated March 1919, in Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Yin-ping-shih ho-chi 飲冰室合集 (Collected works from the Ice-Drinker's studio), Vol.5, Part 23 (Shanghai, 1936), pp.1-162.

187. Lin Shu 林紓 , "Ching-sheng" 荆生 (Ching-sheng), reprinted in Hu Shih, ed. Chien-she li-lun chi 建設理論集 (A collection of essays concerning the construction of the new literature), in Chao Chia-pi, ed. Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi, Vol.1, pp.174-175.

188. Liu Fu 劉復 (Liu Pan-nung 劉半農), "Wo-chih wen-hsüeh kai-liang kuan" 我之文學改良觀 (My view on literary reform), HCN 3/3 (May 1, 1917), pp.1-13.

189. ——— reply to Wang Ch'ing-hsüan in the "Correspondence" column, HCN 4/3 (Mar.15, 1918), pp.268-285.

190. Lo Chia-lun 羅家倫 "Chin-jih Chung-kuo chih tsa-chih chieh" 今日中國之雜誌界 (The world of Chinese magazines today), Hsin ch'ao, Vol.1, No.4 (April 1, 1919), pp.625-634.

191. ——— "I-nien-lai wo-men hsüeh-sheng yün-tung ti ch'eng-kung shih-pai ho chiang-lai ying ch'ü ti fang-chen" 一年來我們學生運動的成功失敗和將來應取的方針 (The success and failure of our students' movement in the last year and the future direction that it should take), Hsin ch'ao, Vol.2 No.4 (May 1920), pp.846-861.

192. Lu Hsün 魯迅 , "K'uang-jen jih-chi" 狂人日記 (Diary of a madman), HCN 4/5 (May 15, 1918), pp.414-424.

193. ——— "Wo chih chieh-lieh kuan" 我之節烈觀 (My view on rigid chastity), HCN 5/2 (Aug.15, 1918), pp.92-101.

194. ——— contributions to the "Random Thoughts" column, HCN 5/4 - 6/6 (Oct.15, 1918 - Nov.1, 1919).

195. ——— "K'ung I-chi" 孔乙己 (K'ung I-chi), HCN 6/4 (April 15, 1919), pp.375-378.

196. ——— "Yo" 藥 (Medicine), HCN 6/5 (May 1919), pp.479-484.

197. Mao Tse-tung 毛澤東 (under the pseudonym of Erh-shih-pa-hua Sheng 二十八劃生), "Ti-yü chih yen-chiu" 體育之研究 (A study of physical education), HCN 3/2 (April 1, 1917), pp.1-11.

198. ——— Mao Tse-tung hsüan-chi 毛澤東選集 (Selected works of Mao Tse-tung), 4 volumes (Peking, 1968).

199. Mei-chou p'ing-lun 每週評論 (Weekly Critic), No.1-37, 1918-1919 (Peking).

200. Ou Sheng-pai 區聲白 & Ch'en Tu-hsiu, "Tao-lun wu-cheng-fu chu-i" 討論無政府主義 (A discussion of anarchism), HCN 9/4 (Aug.1, 1921), pp.1-32.

201. "Pei-ching kung-tu hu-chu t'uan hsiao-hsi" 北京工讀互助團消息 (News of the Peking Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.185-188.

202. "Pei-ching kung-tu hu-chu t'uan hsiao-hsi" 北京工讀互助團消息 (News of the Peking Work-and-Study Cooperative Corps), HCN 7/3 (Feb.1, 1920), pp.151-153.

203. P'eng Ming 彭明 , "Wu-ssu shih-ch'i ti Li Ta-chao ho Ch'en Tu-hsiu" 五四時期的李大釗和陳獨秀 (Li Ta-chao and Ch'en Tu-hsiu during the May Fourth period), Li-shih yen-chiu 歷史研究 (Historical Research), No.6, 1962 (Peking).

204. P'eng Shu-chih 彭述之 , "Shui shih Chung-kuo kuo-min ko-ming chih ling-tao-che" 誰是中國國民革命之領導者 ("Who are the leaders of China's national revolution?), HCN Quarterly No.4 (Dec.20, 1924), pp.1-15.

205. "Pien-chi shih tsa-chi" 編輯室雜記 (Miscellaneous notes from the editorial office), HCN 9/1 (May 1, 1921), p.2.

206. Shang-hai che-hsüeh she-hui k'o-hsüeh hsüeh-hui 上海哲學社會科學學會 (Shanghai Philosophical & Social Sciences Association), ed. Chi-nien Wu-ssu yün-tung ssu-shih chou-nien lun-wen chi 紀念五四運動四十周年論文集 (Collection of essays in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the May Fourth movement) (Shanghai, 1960).

207. Shang-hai she-hui k'o-hsüeh yüan Li-shih yen-chiu so 上海社會科學院歷史研究所 (Institute of Historical Research, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences), ed. Wu-ssu yün-tung tsai Shang-hai shih-liao hsüan-chi 五四運動在上海史料選輯 (Collection of historical materials on the May Fourth movement in Shanghai) (Shanghai, 1960).

208. Shen Yen-ping 沈雁冰 (Mao Tun), translated "Yu-O chih kan-hsiang" 遊歐之感想 (Thoughts on a visit to Russia, by Bertrand Russell), HCN 8/2 (Oct.1, 1920), pp.1-22.

209. ——— translated "Lo-su lun So-wei-ai O-lo-ssu" 羅素論蘇維埃俄羅斯 (Russell on Soviet Russia, by Jacob Hartmann), HCN 8/3 (Nov.1, 1920), pp.1-8.

210. Shih Tsün 石峻 , compliled, Chung-kuo chin-tai ssu-hsiang shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao chien-pien 中國近代思想史參考資料簡編 (Collection of source materials on the history of modern Chinese thought) (Peking, 1957).

211. Ssu-ma Lu 司馬璐 ,Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai ch'uan 瞿秋白傳 (A biography of Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai) (Hong Kong, 1962).

212. Ssu Ts'un-t'ung 施存統 , "Ma-k'e-ssu ti kung-ch'an chu-i" 馬克思的共產主義 (The communism of Marx), HCN 9/4 (Aug.1, 1921), pp.1-10.

213. ——— "Tu Hsin K'ai hsien-sheng ti 'Kung-ch'an chu-i yü chi-erh-t'e she-hui chu-i' " 讀新凱先生底"共產主義與基爾特社會主義" (On reading Mr. Hsin K'ai's "Communism and guild socialism"), HCN 9/6 (July 1, 1922), pp.29-35.

214. Sun Yat-sen 孫逸仙 , "Kai-tso Chung-kuo ti ti-i pu" 改造中國的第一步 (The first step in the reformation of China), dated Jan.29, 1920, in Hu Han-min, ed., Tsung-li ch'üan-chi 總理全集 (Complete works of the director-general) (Shanghai, 1930), Part 2, pp.178-180.

215. ——— "Min-kuo chiu-nien yü hai-wai Kuo-min-tang t'ung-chih shu" 民國九年與海外國民黨同志書 (A letter to the overseas Kuomintang comrades in the ninth year of the Republic), dated January 29, 1920, in Tsung-li ch'uan-chi, Part 3, pp.343-348.

216. T'ao Meng-ho 陶孟和 (T'ao Li-kung 陶履恭), "Jen-lei wen-hua chih ch'i-yüan 人類文化之源(The origins of human civilisation), in three parts, HCN 2/5 (Jan.1, 1917), 2/6 (Feb.1, 1917) and 3/1 (Mar.1, 1917).

217. T'ao Meng-ho, "Ou-chan i-hou ti cheng-chih" 歐戰以後的政治 (Politics after the European war), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.459-464.

218. ——— "Wo-men ti cheng-chih sheng-huo" 我們的政治生活 (Our political life), HCN 5/6 (Dec.15, 1918), pp.555-564.

219. ——— "Yu-Ou chih kan-hsiang" 遊歐之感想 (Thoughts on a European visit), HCN 7/1 (Dec.1, 1919), pp.49-55.

230. ——— "Ou Mei lao-tung wen-t'i" 歐美勞動問題 (The labour question in Europe and America), HCN 7/2 (Jan.1, 1920), pp.39-46.

231. Teng Chung-hsia 鄧中夏, Chung-kuo chih-kung yün-tung chien-shih 中國職工運動簡史 (A short history of the Chinese labour movement) (1949)

232. Ting Shou-ho 丁守和, Yin Hsü-i 殷敘彝 & Chang Po-chao 張伯昭, Shih-yüeh Ko-ming tui Chung-kuo ko-ming ti ying-hsiang 十月革命對中國革命的影響 (The influence of the October Revolution on the Chinese revolution) (Peking, 1957).

233. Ts'ai Hsiao-chou 蔡曉舟 & Yang Ching-kung 楊景工, ed. Wu-ssu 五四 (May Fourth), in Chin-tai shih tzu-liao 近代史資料 (Materials on modern history), No.5 (Peking, 1955).

234. Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei 蔡元培, "Lao-kung shen-sheng" 勞工神聖 (The sacredness of labour), HCN 5/5 (Nov.15, 1918), pp.438-439.

235. ——— "Hung-shui yü meng-shou" 洪水與猛獸 (The flood and the wild beast), HCN 7/5 (April 1, 1920), pp.1-2.

236. ——— "Chih Kung-yen pao ta Lin Ch'in-nan han" 致公言報答林琴南函 (Letter to the Public Opinion Daily and in answer to Lin Ch'in-nan (Lin Shu)), reprinted in Hsin ch'ao she 新潮社 (New Tide Society), ed. Ts'ai Chieh-min hsien-sheng yen-hsing lu 蔡孑民先生言行錄 (The life and works of Mr. Ts'ai Chieh-min (Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei)), Vol.2 (Peking, 1920), pp.314-335.

237. ——"我在北京大學的經歷 wo Pei-ching ta-hsüeh ti ching-li" (My experiences in Peking University), Tung-fang tsa-chih 東方雜誌 (Eastern Miscellany), Vol.31, No.1 (Jan. 1934), pp.5-13.

238. Ts'ao Chu-jen 曹聚仁, Wen-t'an wu-shih nien 文壇五十年 (Fifty years in the literary world) (Hong Kong, 1955).

239. ———"Lu Hsün nien-p'u" 魯迅年譜 (A chronological biography of Lu Hsün), Wen-i shih-chi 文藝世紀 (Literary Century), No.1, June 1957 (Hong Kong), pp.26-27.

240. Tseng Hsü-pai 曾虛白 , Chung-kuo hsin-wen shih 中國新聞史 (A history of Chinese journalism) (Taipeh, 1966).

241. Tso Shun-sheng 左舜生 , Chin san-shih nien chien-wen tsa-chi 近三十年見聞雜記 (A miscellaneous record of recollections of the last thirty years) (Hong Kong, 1952).

242. Tu Hsüeh-wen 杜學文 , "Kuan-yü Ch'en Tu-hsiu ti chieh-lun" 關於陳獨秀的結論 (A conclusion concerning Ch'en Tu-hsiu), Ta-kung pao 大公報 (Impartial Daily), July 9, 1971 (Hong Kong).

243. "Tu-wei po-shih yen-chiang lu" 杜威博士演講錄 (A record of Dr. Dewey's speeches), HCN 7/1-3 (Dec.1 1919 - Feb.1, 1920).

244. "Tui-yü O-lu-ssu lao-nung cheng-fu t'ung-kao ti yü-lun" 對於俄羅斯勞農政府通告的輿論 (Public opinion on the proclamation of the Russian Government of Workers and Peasants), HCN 7/6 (May 1, 1920), pp.1-29.

245. Wang Che-fu 王哲甫 , Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh yün-tung shih 中國新文學運動史 (A history of the Chinese new literature movement) (Peking, 1933).

246. Wang Chien-min 王健民 , Chung-kuo kung-ch'an tang shih-kao 中國共產黨史稿 (A draft history of the Chinese Communist Party), 3 volumes (Taipeh, 1965).

247. Wang Kuang-ch'i 王光祈 , "Kung-tso yü jen-sheng" 工作與人生 (Work and life), HCN 6/4 (April 15, 1919), pp.379-381.

248. Wang Shen-jan 王森然 , Chin-tai erh-shih chia p'ing-ch'uan 近代二十家評傳 (Critical biographies of twenty modern Chinese) (Peking, 1934).

249. Wang Wen-shan 王文山 (under the pen-name of Ling-shuang 凌霜), "Ma-k'e-ssu hsüeh-shuo ti p'i-p'ing" 馬克思學說的批評 (A critique of Marxist theory), HCN 6/5 (May 1919), pp.466-469.

250. "Wen-hsüeh yen-chiu hui hsüan-yen" 文學研究會宣言 (Manifesto of the Society for Literary Studies), HCN 8/5 (Jan.1, 1921), pp.1-3.

251. "Wo-men ti cheng-chih chu-chang" 我們的政治主張 "Our political proposals", dated May 14, 1922, in Hu Shih wen-ts'un, Volume 2, Part 3, pp.27-34.

252. Wu Chih-hui 吳稚暉 , "Ch'ing-nien yü kung-chü" 青年與工具 (Youth and tools), HCN 2/2 (Oct.1, 1916), pp.1-6.

253. "Wu-ssu yün-tung wu-shih nien" 五四運動五十年 (Fifty year of the May Fourth movement), joint editorial in People's Daily, Red Flag and Liberation Army's Daily on May 3rd, 1969, reprinted in a booklet-form by the San-lien Bookshop (Hong Kong, 1969).

254. Wu Yü 吳虞 , "Chia-tsu chih-tu wei chuan-chih chu-i chih ken-chü lun" 家族制度為專制主義之根據論 (On the family and clan system as the basis of despotism), HCN 2/6 (Feb.1, 1917), pp.1-4.

255. ——— "Ju-chia chu-chang chieh-chi chih-tu chih hai" 儒家主張階級制度之害 (The harm of the Confucianists' advocacy of the class system), HCN 3/4 (June 1, 1917), pp.1-4.

256. "Ya-ch'ien nung-min hsieh-hui hsüan-yen" 衙前農民協會宣言 (Declaration of the Ya-ch'ien Peasants' Association), HCN 9/4 (Aug.1, 1921), pp.1-2.

257. Yang Chang-ch'i 楊昌濟 "Chih-sheng pien" 治生篇 (The philosophy of life), HCN 2/4-5 (Dec.1, 1916 & Jan.1,1917), pp.1-8, pp.1-8.

258. Yang Chih-hua 楊之華 , ed. Wen-t'an shih-liao 文壇史料 (Historical materials on the literary world) (Shanghai, 1944).

259. Yang Tuan-liu 楊端六 , "Ho Lo-su hsien-hseng ti t'an-hua" 和羅素先生的談話 (Talks with Mr. Russell), in Ch'en Tu-hsiu ed. "Kuan-yü she-hui chu-i ti t'ao-lun" 關於社會主義的討論 (A discussion concerning socialism), HCN 8/4 (Dec.1, 1920), pp.15-16.

260. Yi Pai-sha 易白沙 "K'ung-tzu p'ing-i" 孔子評議 (A discussion of Confucius), HCN 1/6 (Feb.15, 1916), pp.1-6.

261. Yin Hai-kuang 殷海光 , Chung-kuo wen-fa ti chan-wang 中國文化的展望 (The outlook for Chinese culture), 2 volumes (Taipeh, 1966).

WESTERN WORKS.

262. Boorman, Howard L., Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, 4 volumes (Columbia U. Press, 1967-1971).

263. Brandt, Conrad, Benjamin Schwartz & John K. Fairbank, ed. A Documentary History of Chinese Communism (New York, 1967).

264. Cameron, M.E., The Reform Movement in China 1898-1912 (Stanford U. Press, 1931).

265. Chan Lien, "Chinese Communism Versus Pragmatism, the Criticism of Hu Shih's Philosophy, 1950-58", Journal of Asian Studies, Vol.27, No.3 (May 1968), pp.551-570.

266. Chesneaux, Jean, The Chinese Labour Movement, 1919-27 (Stanford U. Press,1968).

267. Chiang Kai-shek, China's Destiny, translated by Philip Jaffe (London, 1947).

268. Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement (Stanford U. Press, 1960).

269. Chow Tse-tsung, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement (Harvard U. Press, 1963).

270. Clopton, Robert W., & Tsuin-chen Ou, John Dewey: Lectures in China, 1919-1920 (U. of Hawaii, 1973).

271. Dewey, John, "Transforming the Mind of China", Asia, Volume 19 (November 1919), pp.1103-1108.

272. ——— "The Sequel of the Student Revolt", New Republic, Volume 21 (Mar.3, 1920), pp.380-382.

273. ——— "New Culture in China", Asia. Volume 21 (July 1921), pp.581-586.

274. Encausse, Hélène Carrère d', & Stuart Schram, Marxism & Asia (London, 1969).

275. Feuerwerker, Albert, & S. Cheng, Chinese Communist Studies of Modern Chinese History (Harvard U. Press, 1961).

276. Fung Yu-lan, A Short History of Chinese Philosophy (New York, 1966).

277. Gray, Jack, ed. Modern China's Search for a Political Form (Oxford U. Press, 1969).

278. Grieder, Jerome, Hu Shih & the Chinese Renaissance (Harvard U. Press, 1970).

279. Ho Ping-ti & Tang Tsou, ed. China in Crisis, Volume 1, Books 1 & 2 (U. of Chicago Press, 1968).

280. Hsia, C.T., A History of Modern Chinese Fiction (Yale U. Press, 1971).

281. Hsia, T.A., "Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai's Autobiographical Writings: the Making & Destruction of a 'Tender-Hearted Communist' ", China Quarterly, No.25 (Jan.-Mar.1966), pp.176-212.

282. Hu Sheng, Imperialism & Chinese Politics (Peking, 1955).

283. Hu Shih, The Chinese Renaissance (U. of Chicago Press, 1934).

284. ——— "Which Road Shall We Follow?", dated Dec.10, 1929, in Hu Shih & Lin Yutang, China's Own Critics (Peking, 1931).

285. Huang Sung-k'ang, Lu Hsün & the New Culture of Modern China (Amsterdam, 1957).

286. ——— Li Ta-chao & the Impact of Marxism on Modern Chinese Thinking (Paris, 1965).

287. Israel, John, Student Nationalism in China (Stanford U. Press, 1966).

288. Johnson, Chalmers, ed. Ideology & Politics in Contemporary China (U. of Washington Press, 1973).

289. Kagan, Richard C., "Ch'en Tu-hsiu's Unfinished Autobiography", China Quarterly, No.50 (Apr.-June 1972), pp.295-314.

290. Kiang Wen-han, The Chinese Student Movement (New York, 1948).

291. Klein, Donald W., & Anne B. Clark, Biographical Dictationary of Chinese Communism, 1921-1925, 2 volumes (Harvard U. Press, 1971).

292. Kwok, D.W.Y., Scientism in Chinese Thought, 1900-1950 (Yale U. Press, 1965).

293. Lee,Leo Ou-fan, The Romantic Generation of Modern Chinese Writers (Harvard U. Press, 1973).

294. Levenson, J.R., Confucian China & Its Modern Fate, 3 volumes (London, 1958, 1964, 1965).

295. ——— Liang Ch'i-ch'ao & the Mind of Modern China (U. of California Press, 1959).

296. ——— "The Intellectual Revolution in China", in Albert Feuerwerker, ed. Modern China (Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp.154-168.

297. Lewis, John Wilson, Leadership in Communist China (Cornell U. Press, 1966).

298. Li Chien-nung, The Political History of China, 1840-1928, translated and edited by Teng Ssu-yu and Jeremy Ingalls (Princeton U. Press, 1956).

299. Li Yu-ming, The Introduction of Socialism into China (Columbia U. Press, 1971).

300. Lin Yutang, A History of the Press & Public Opinion in China (London, 1937).

301. Liu Chun-jo, Controversies in Modern Chinese Intellectual History: An Analytical Bibliography of Periodical Articles, Mainly of the May Fourth & Post-May Fourth Era (Harvard U. Press, 1964).

302. Lu Hsün, Selected Works of Lu Hsün, 4 volumes (Peking, 1956).

303. Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, Vols.1-4 (Peking, 1967, 1965, 1965, 1967)

304. Meisner, Maurice, Li Ta-chao & the Origins of Chinese Marxism (Harvard U. Press, 1967).

305. Moore, Barrington, Jnr., Social Origins of Dictatorship & Democracy (London, 1967).

306. Scalapino, R.A., & Harold Schifferin, "Early Socialist Currents in the Chinese Revolutionary Movement", Journal of Asian Studies, Vol.18 No.3 (May, 1959), pp.321-342.

307. Schram, Stuart R., Mao Tse-tung (London, 1967).

308. ——— The Political Thought of Mao Tse-tung, enlarged and revised editon (London, 1969).

309. ——— "From the 'Great Union of Popular Masses' to the 'Great Alliance' ", China Quarterly, No.49 (Jan.-Mar.1972), pp.88-105.

310. Schurmann, Franz, Ideology & Organisation in Communist China (U. of California Press, 1968).

311. Schwartz, Benjamin I., "Ch'en Tu-hsiu & the Acceptance of the Modern West", Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.12, No.1 (Jan.1951), pp.61-74.

312. ——— "The Intelligentsia in Communist China", Daedalus (Summer, 1960), pp.604-621.

313. ——— Chinese Communism & the Rise of Mao (Harvard U. Press, 1964).

314. ——— ed. Reflections On the May Fourth Movement (Harvard U. Press, 1972).

315. Edgar Snow, Red Star Over China, first revised and enlarged edition (London, 1972).

316. Tagore, Amitendranath, Literary Debates in Modern China, 1918-1937 (Tokyo, 1967).

317. Tan, Chester C., Chinese Political Thought in the Twentieth Century (New York, 1971).

318. Teng Ssu-yu & John K. Fairbank, China's Response to the West (New York, 1963).

319. Union Research Institute, Who's Who in Communist China (Hong Kong, 1966).

320. Wang Y.C., Chinese Intellectuals & the West, 1872-1949 (U. of N. Carolina Press, 1966).

321. Wilbur, C. Martin, "The Influence of the Past: How the Early Years Helped to Shape the Future of the CCP", in John Wilson Lewis ed., Party Leadership & Revolutionary Power in China (Cambridge U. Press, 1970), pp.35-68.

322. Wright, Mary Clabaugh, The Last Stand of Chinese Conservatism (Stanford U. Press, 1957).

323. ——— ed. China in Revolution, The First Phase 1900-1913 (Yale U. Press, 1963).